DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 620 SP 028 502

AUTHOR Watt, Michael G.
TITLE Selecting and Evaluating Curriculum Materials. A Study of Teacher Education for Bilingual-Bicultural and Multicultural Educators.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 215p.
AVAILABLE FROM Michael G. Watt, Division of Educational Programs, Education Dept. of Tasmania, P.O. Box 256, North Hobart, Tasmania, Australia (Aust. $5.00 plus postage).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Instructional Materials; Evaluation Methods; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; *Media Selection; *Multicultural Education; Teacher Education Curriculum; *Textbook Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Australia (Tasmania)

ABSTRACT

This document reports on a project with the following aims: (1) to identify and discuss the important issues about using curriculum materials in bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education through a comparative analysis of these conditions in the United States and Australia; (2) to identify and analyze relevant research in the idexes of the Educational Resources Information Center, the Australian Education Index, and the British Education Index; (3) to review the activities of three institutions--the Social Science Education Consortium, the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, and the Centre for Educational Technology at the University of Sussex--involved in the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials, with particular reference to the characteristics of their programs for teacher education; (4) to present a description for an inservice teacher education program that aims to develop the knowledge and skills of teachers in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education; (5) to present alternative models and approaches to implement the inservice teacher education program; and (6) to conclude with a commentary on introducing to Australian education the techniques for both selecting and evaluating curriculum materials and implementing teacher education programs. A bibliography, author index, and nine appendices are included. (Among the appendices are a list of the organizations forming the national network of bilingual education, five bibliographics from specific educational indexes, and materials pertaining to a survey on the need for a course designed to improve the quality of selection and evaluation of curriculum materials.) (Author/JD)

ED279620

SELECTING AND EVALUATING CURRICULUM MATERIALS

A STUDY OF TEACHER EDUCATION FOR BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL AND MULTICULTURAL EDUCATORS

MICHAEL G. WATT

Copyright (c) 1987 by Michael G. Watt

SP028 502

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. G. Watt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Table of Contents	i
	Table of Tables	iii
	Table of Appendices	iv
	Acknowledgements	v
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Problems about Quality, Selection and Evaluation of Curriculum Materials	2
1.2	Factors determining the Quality of Bilingual-bicultural and Multicultural Materials	7
1.2.1	The Nature of Key Issues	7
1.2.2	Literary Treatment discussing the Use of Curriculum Materials in Bilingual-bicultural and Multicultural Education	8
1.2.2.1	United States of America	9
1.2.2.2	Australia	12
1.2.3	Conclusion	15
2.	SELECTION AND EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE	16
2.1	Non-journal Works	17
2.1.1	*Resources in Education*	17
2.1.1.1	The Procedures	17
2.1.1.2	The Results	17
2.1.2	*Australian Education Index*	22
2.2	Journal Articles	23
2.2.1	*Current Index to Journals in Education*	23
2.2.1.1	The Procedures	23
2.2.1.2	The Results	23
2.2.2	*Australian Education Index*	26
2.2.2.1	The Procedures	26
2.2.2.2	The Results	26
2.2.3	*The British Education Index*	27
2.2.3.1	The Procedures	27
2.2.3.2	The Results	28
2.3	Discussion	29
2.4	Conclusion	30
3.	REVIEW OF INSTITUTIONAL ACTIVITIES	32
3.1	Social Science Education Consortium	34
3.1.1	The Process for Selecting Curriculum Materials	34
3.1.2	The Evaluation Instrument	34
3.1.3	Applications to Teacher Education	36
3.2	Educational Products Information Exchange Institute	38
3.2.1	The Process for Selecting Curriculum Materials	39
3.2.2	The Evaluation Instrument	40
3.2.3	Applications to Teacher Education	42
3.3	Centre for Educational Technology, University of Sussex	53
3.3.1	The Process for Selecting Curriculum Materials	54

..ii

3.3.2 The Evaluation Instrument 54
3.3.3 Applications to Teacher Education 56
3.4 Other Sources 59
3.4.1 General Treatment 60
4.4.1.1 Special Education Supervisor Training Project, The University of Texas at Austin 61
3.4.1.2 The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University 62
3.4.1.3 Northern Illinois University, De Kalb and Region I Adult Education Service Center, Chicago 64
3.4.2 Bilingual-bicultural Education, Multicultural Education and Related Areas 67
3.4.2.1 Teacher Corps Bilingual Project, University of Hartford, Hartford, Connecticutt 68
3.4.2.2 Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California 70
3.4.2.3 Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio 71
3.5 Conclusion 74

4. THE PROPOSAL FOR A TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM 76
4.1 Introduction 76
4.2 Preliminary Steps 79
4.2.1 Needs Assessment 79
4.2.2 Antecedent Conditions 81
4.3 The Constructs of the Curriculum 82
4.3.1 Formulating Objectives 82
4.3.2 Selecting Content 84
4.3.3 Organising Content 90
4.3.4 Selecting and Organising Learning Experiences 91
4.3.5 Evaluating 93
4.3.6 Checking for Balance and Sequence 94
4.4 Conclusion 95

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSAL FOR A TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM 97
5.1 Teacher Education in Tasmania 97
5.1.1 The Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers 98
5.1.2 General Programs 100
5.2 Models and Approaches for Teacher Education 100
5.2.1 The Formal Award-bearing Model 103
5.2.1.1 The Curriculum Studies Approach 104
5.2.1.2 The Subject-oriented Approach 105
5.2.1.3 The Multidisciplinary, Team Teaching Approach 105
5.2.2 The Informal Non-award-bearing Model 107
5.2.3 The Tutor Training Model 108
5.3 Conclusion 111

6. CONCLUSION 112

Bibliography 117

Author Index 124

Appendices

...iii

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1 Documents indexed in E.R.I.C., *Resources in Education*, by Year of Publication

Table 2 Documents indexed in E.R.I.C., *Resources in Education*, by Year of Indexing

Table 3 Journals indexed in E.R.I.C., *Current Index to Journals in Education*, by Population and Study Sample, January 1980 through to December 1985

Table 4 Articles indexed in E.R.I.C., *Current Index to Journals in Education*, by Journal and Year of Publication

Table 5 Articles indexed in E.R.I.C., *Current Index to Journals in Education*, by Year of Indexing

Table 6 Articles indexed in the *Australian Education Index*, by Journal and Year of Publication

Table 7 Articles indexed in the *British Education Index*, by Journal and Year of Publication

Table 8 The Organisation of the Content of the Teacher Education Program

Table 9 The Organisation of the Learning Experiences for the Teacher Education Program

Table 10 Test Specifications for a Criterion-referenced Post-test for Summative Assessment of Topic 1

TABLE OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1 The National Network for Bilingual Education

Appendix 2 Bibliography of Resources in *Resources in Education*

Appendix 3 Bibliography of Resources in *Current Index to Journals in Education*

Appendix 4 Bibliography of Journal Articles in the *British Education Index*

Appendix 5 Bibliography of Non-journal Works in the *Australian Education Index*

Appendix 6 Bibliography of Journal Articles in the *Australian Education Index*

Appendix 7 Extract from the Introductory Letter to the Survey

Appendix 8 The Results of the Survey of Course Co-ordinators of the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers

Appendix 9 List of Courses developed by the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers

...v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Only with the assistance of a number of people was it possible to establish valid aims and directions to complete this report. The supervisor, Bevis Yaxley, Senior Lecturer in Education, The University of Tasmania, and the experienced teachers participating in the Centre for Continuing Education of Teacher's course, Curriculum Management and Delivery, held at The University of Tasmania --- Janet Clippingdale, Peter Gayton, Philip Page and Peter Storr --- are to be thanked for their contributions.

The author also wishes to acknowledge the assistance given by several colleagues of the Education Department of Tasmania in facilitating completion and reproduction of this document. John Worley, Educational Measurement Unit, provided numerous stylistic improvements to Chapter 1 and Chapter 3 of the report. Malcolm Kays and Donald Palmer, Educational Measurement Unit, conducted the statistical procedures on the data presented in Chapter 2 of the report. Warren Brewer, Superintendent, Curriculum Development and Evaluation Section, provided facilities to reproduce copies of the final document. Pamela Curtain, Kerryn Langford and Lorraine Lovell provided assistance by typing a number of the tables that appear throughout the report and also typed correspondence.

It was only possible to establish the research bases for this report through extensive correspondence. P. Kenneth Komoski, Executive Director, Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, Water Mill, New York, is to be thanked for providing copies of EPIE Institute's materials used to train their selectors and evaluators of educational materials. These included copies of the *Curriculum/Content/Evaluation Module* and the *EPIE Institute Inservice Training Modules for Helping Schools to make Effective Use of the Degrees of Reading Power.* Mr. Komoski is to be thanked for reviewing Section 3.2 of this document and providing additional information about current developments at EPIE Institute. He is also to be thanked for granting permission to cite and reprint from the *Development of a System for an Educational Products Information Exchange* and 'What Curriculum Leaders need to know about Selecting Instructional Materials'. The basis for the research also depended upon information provided by other staff of EPIE Institute during earlier correspondence, in particular, David L. Elliott, Director of EPIE Institute's Western Projects Office, Berkeley, California, who provided helpful information about the development of the evaluation instruments used by EPIE Institute.

The research also depended upon assistance provided during previous correspondence with several educational institutions. Kay K. Cook, Staff Associate, Social Science Education Consortium, Boulder, Colorado, is to be thanked for providing a copy of the *Curriculum Materials Analysis System.* Michael Eraut, Reader in Education, The University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton, Sussex granted permission to cite and reprint from *The Analysis of Curriculum Materials.*

"The need for such inservice training is enormous because training in materials selection is taught in so few colleges. Lately, faculty in teacher training colleges have become interested in EPIE's materials as the basis for courses at their institutions. The sooner this sort of training becomes a priority in local school districts and teachers colleges, the sooner the problem of misfitting materials to the requirements of teachers and to the needs of learners will be solved. In the meantime, the price we are all paying in wasted instructional productivity is enormous."

P. Kenneth Komoski, President and Executive Director, Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, 1980, 'What Curriculum Leaders need to know about Selecting Instructional Materials', paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Atlanta, Georgia, 29 March to 2 April 1980, page 5.

1. INTRODUCTION

Evidence derived from practices in bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education in North America and, more recently, Australia suggests that the quality of curriculum materials is critical in determining the success or failure of such educational programs. This reality is exacerbated by particular problems posed for educators in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials used in bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education. Despite such apparent concerns among educators, their failure to respond by improving the quality of selection and evaluation of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education is partly a consequence of inadequate preservice and inservice teacher education.

The purpose of this paper is to address the problem of improving the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials for these programs. This will be tackled by conducting a review to identify the current literature in this field; reviewing the activities of institutions involved in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials, with particular reference to their provision of programs for teacher education; presenting, as a case study, a proposal for a program in inservice teacher education to develop knowledge and skills of teachers in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education that are appropriate to Australian conditions; and presenting three alternative models for implementing this proposal.

Initially, however, it will be helpful to analyse in greater depth the important issues involving the selection and evaluation of curriculum

....2

materials for bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education. This will be approached through a comparative treatment of the current situations in the United States of America and Australia.

1.1 Problems about Quality, Selection and Evaluation of Curriculum Materials

Textbook adoption procedures have been enacted by all states of the United States. Four distinguishable types of procedure have been adopted for textbook selection, varying from a centralised model based upon a state selection committee to a decentralised model within local school districts. In the centralised model, used by twenty-two states, state selection committees, varying from six to thirty members each, use criteria developed at the state level to select textbooks for their respective states. In the decentralised model, school districts in twenty-eight states develop their own criteria, which are then used by local selection committees to screen instructional materials. In the third model, school districts in one state select textbooks for secondary level and use lists compiled by the state board of education to select materials at the primary level. In the fourth model, school districts in three states use lists compiled by state boards of education to select all instructional materials, although one of these states, California, is presently transferring to the centralised model (Blaunstein, 1983; Duke, 1985).

The extent to which those states, practising a centralised form of selection have formalised its features, are of greatest significance for moves towards improving practices of selection and evaluation of curriculum materials.

....3

After completing an extensive comparative survey of state selection committees in each of these twenty-two states, Duke found considerable variety in their application of procedures for selecting curriculum materials.

Reflecting cross-sections of both educational and lay communities, state selection committees recommend textbooks to state boards of education for listing, in all but two states. The duration of the adoption process varies from three months to more than a year among these states. Curriculum materials proposed for adoption are usually made publicly accessible through materials display centres throughout this period. The procedures for adoption also vary widely with some states applying objective criteria to evaluate curriculum materials whilst others make subjective decisions only. Selection committees also compile annotations of materials adopted although only nine of these states extend annotations beyond basic purchasing information.

Duke also surveyed the extent of training for members of selection committees. The implication of his findings for the hypothesis presented in this paper is immediately apparent when he states that:

> "... ten states provide no training for evaluators in the use of such criteria. The remaining twelve states offer sessions which range from one to two days. Typically in these sessions, which are conducted by the state office of education staff, evaluators receive information about the responsibilities of a textbook committee member, the adoption process - usually the time line - regulations about dealings with publishers and their representatives, and other legal requirements. In most cases, evaluators do not appear to receive training in applying criteria to actual sample texts and in almost all cases evaluators do not meet again to review materials or to compare findings" (11-12).

....4

The diversity of textbook adoption policies has influenced responses by publishers and different interest groups involved in selection processes. States which have adopted centralised policies have consistently attracted the interests of large-scale publishers by providing large markets, specified criteria related to the technical quality of publication and have been influenced by special interest groups. Despite their effect upon improving selection procedures, centralised policies in textbook adoption have not tended to improve the quality or appropriateness of curriculum materials.

Klein (1978) identified five major issues concerning the development, selection and evaluation of curriculum materials: determining the characteristics of quality in curriculum materials; determining the types of research methodologies to provide information about curriculum materials; incorporating learner-based verification and revision; defining responsibility for learning resulting from curriculum materials; and specifying the rights of interest groups to determine the materials to be used. Komoski (1980) has referred to the failure of schools to assess their learning needs sufficiently to be able to match curriculum materials to learners' capabilities and to the failure of publishers to provide this information. Additionally, Blaunstein identified particular problems concerning the selection processes used in adopting curriculum materials. There is a need for education departments to provide more resources to update curriculum materials, and provide paid release for educators to participate on selection committees. The implications of each of these points are briefly discussed below.

Although criteria applied by selectors and evaluators of curriculum materials are based upon a premise that these criteria relate to the quality of materials, there is little research available to indicate that such criteria

....5

are sufficiently comprehensive for selectors and evaluators to judge the intrinsic nature of quality in curriculum materials. Research is necessary to determine what makes for curriculum materials of high quality. Criteria for judging other materials can then be derived from the results of this research.

A further difficulty is imposed by the limitations of research methodologies used to investigate curriculum materials. Generally, experimental designs applying a test-teach-retest model have been applied to investigating what has been learnt from materials. Although these designs appear to be effective in providing answers about materials meant to develop cognitive behaviours, it is unlikely that such designs are appropriate for providing answers about materials meant to develop affective, psychomotor or a combination of behaviours. It is more likely that systematic observation and interview techniques rather than experimental designs will provide valid answers about how materials affect learners' values and physical performances. Furthermore, experimental designs cannot account for all the antecedent conditions and contextual variables that are involved in learning from curriculum materials. It is evident that research methodologies to investigate various aspects of curriculum materials will need to be extended if valid answers are to be provided.

Learner-based verification and revision of curriculum materials refer to procedures for gathering and analysing data obtained from field-testing materials with appropriate groups of learners. Providing learner-based verification and revision for developing curriculum materials has become a particularly controversial issue in American education, largely through

....6

efforts by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute to effect legislative enactments in California in 1972 and Florida in 1975. Komoski (1975) has identified six guidelines upon which the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute nas based implementation of learner-based verification in curriculum materials: firstly, for developing, improving and maintaining quality and reliability; secondly, for supplying data producers' need to provide responsible statements about their products; thirdly, for establishing a continuous process that accrues throughout the material's life; fourthly, specifying learners as the primary source for providing data and that data drawn from secondary sources must relate to learner behaviours; fifthly, that learner-based verification should be sufficiently detailed to identify strengths and weaknesses of the material; and finally, that it is the producers' responsibility to gather and analyse such data validly and apply it to improving the effectiveness of their products. Such guidelines, however, have not overcome certain intractable features of learner-based verification and revision. For instance, limits have not been clearly established as to which materials learner-based verification and revision should apply to; sampling procedures have not been clearly defined; issues relating to the replication of procedures and the generalisation of findings have not been solved; and the relationship between learner-based verification and revision and quality in curriculum materials has not been established by research.

An additional difficulty is whether the publishers of curriculum materials or the teachers who use them are to accept responsibility for the learning resulting from the curriculum materials. Publishers have usually been criticised for any aspects of bias that might be present in curriculum

....7

materials. On the other hand, publishers have sought to shift to classroom teachers responsibility for learning resulting from curriculum materials. Although shared between publishers and teachers, there is a reluctance for this to be accepted by either party.

The final problem relates to the involvement of different interest groups in the selection of curriculum materials. The influences of agencies funding curriculum materials to maintain control of the materials' contents, the responsibilities of education departments, the activities of professional groups and the controversial assertion of rights by community groups to censor certain materials, have collectively tended to widen the numbers and composition of groups involved in the process of selection.

1.2 Factors determining the Quality of Bilingual-bicultural and Multicultural Materials

1.2.1 The Nature of Key Issues

The selectors and evaluators of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education have looked at several obtrusive problems related to such materials. These problems concern the linguistic content and language level of bilingual materials, and the cultural relevance and biases in bicultural and multicultural materials.

These problems are consistent with three forms of bias identified by Mackey (1977): linguistic, cultural and socio-economic. Linguistic

....8

bias arises when the standard language of a colonial or immigrant group is at lexical variance to the standard language of the homeland. Such linguistic bias in bilingual materials is inappropiate in bilingual-bicultural programs for immigrant groups, when such materials have been adopted without adaptation or in a translated form from the homeland or another immigrant context of a linguistically identical group. Examples of linguistic bias are the use of a regional dialect; of culturally-charged language that has no equivalent meaning in the same language spoken by another immigrant group; and of language unacceptable in its standards of grammar, syntax and morphology. Within bicultural and multicultural materials, biases depicting cultural groups through stereotypes will reflect the culture of the homeland or a linguistically identical group from another location to the extent that such features cannot be readily recognised by immigrants. The issue of cultural biases in curriculum materials has attracted considerable attention in the United States and Canada during the past two decades.

1.2.2 Literary Treatment discussing the Use of Curriculum Materials in Bilingual-bicultural and Multicultural Education

It can be seen that scholars writing in the fields of bilingualism and bilingual-bicultural education, multiculturalism and multicultural education have recognised for some time that the quality of curriculum materials affects the success of educational programs in these areas. The following discussion will provide a comparative treatment of preparation, selection and evaluation of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural and multicultural programs in the United States and Australia.

....9

1.2.2.1 The United States of America

The recent developments occurring in bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education in the United States have been mutually complementary. A recent review by Ambert and Melendez (1985) supports previous authoritative accounts by Cordasco (1976), Andersson and Boyer (1978) and Saville and Troike (1978). Ambert and Melendez indicate that eleven states have passed laws mandating bilingual education and nineteen states have passed legislation permitting bilingual education during the period since enactment of the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) in 1968.

The provision of bilingual-bicultural programs generally reflects the distribution of immigrant groups in the United States. However, Spanish-Americans, particularly Chicanos (Mexican-Americans) have received a more favourable allocation of bilingual-bicultural programs than other ethnic groups. The annually updated survey of bilingual-bicultural programs (Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Bicultural Education, 1975) indicated a total of 320 programs operated in forty-one states and territories. The majority of these programs have been directed towards Spanish-speaking Chicanos in the southwestern states, Spanish-speaking Puerto Ricans in the northeastern states, and native Americans (Amerindians).

The number of American schools offering programs in cross-cultural education is extensive but these schools have developed different educational practices to express particular philosophical perspectives (Gibson, 1976). Banks (1981) identifies three types of cross-cultural education. These are multicultural education aimed at imparting concepts such as prejudice and discrimination in common terms for different cultural

....10

groups; multiethnic education which involves modifying school environments to provide equal educational opportunities for different ethnic groups; and ethnic studies, aimed at the transmission of knowledge about a variety of ethnic groups. Because of a lack of conceptual clarification in the use of these terms for different types of cross-cultural education, these types should not be considered to be mutually exclusive.

A comprehensive treatment of the development, selection and evaluation of curriculum materials for implementation in bilingual-bicultural programs in the United States has been provided by Blanco (1977, 1978). This writer indicated that initially the quality of bilingual-bicultural materials was diminished by hasty preparation on the part of publishers who recognised a potentially lucrative market, especially among Spanish-speaking groups. The quality of such materials improved, however, once the National Network for Bilingual Education was established by means of Title VII legislation. This network comprises nine federally sponsored materials development centres, which have the purpose of developing instructional, teacher-training and testing materials in the languages of the major non-English speaking ethnic groups and at the grade levels of particular bilingual target groups; seven resource centres which train school personnel in the use of bilingual-bicultural materials and provide facilities for field-testing materials developed by the materials development centres; and two dissemination and assessment centres, which identify, edit, reproduce, review and distribute bilingual-bicultural materials. The characteristics of this network are listed in Appendix 1.

Additionally, several of the nine research and development centres established by the United States Office of Education under the Research and Development

....11

Centers Program (1963) and the eight regional educational laboratories established under United States Office of Education guidelines during 1965 and 1966, have been involved in the development of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education. Examples of significant initiatives by research and development centres and regional educational laboratories have been those of The Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California at Los Angeles, to develop the *System for Objectives-based Evaluation of Reading - Spanish*, a criterion-referenced instrument to assist teachers in selecting and cataloguing objectives for assessing students' needs; and the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas, to develop a variety of bilingual Spanish-English curriculum materials.

Current activities to develop, select and evaluate curriculum materials for multicultural education, multiethnic education and ethnic studies have not been as extensive or comprehensive as activities indicated for bilingual-bicultural education. Responsibilities for these activities have been largely given to state education departments and local school districts although the Social Science Education Consortium, Boulder, Colorado, has assisted by identifying, editing, reproducing, reviewing and disseminating curriculum materials as part of responsibilities under the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program.

One can see that despite the autonomy of states to determine educational policies, the American situation is characterised by federal legislative intervention through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to establish nationally, the Bilingual Education Programs (Title VII) and the Ethnic Heritage Studies Programs (Title IX). Federal intervention within the

....12

Bilingual Education Programs has been most extensive, leading to the establishment of a network of institutions to facilitate development and dissemination of bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials. The federal government has also funded projects to develop bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials through several of the regional educational laboratories. These projects have been intended to support bilingual programs offered by education service centres and school districts. Although federal intervention within the Ethnic Heritage Studies Programs has not been as obtrusive as within the Bilingual Education Programs, funding of projects to develop multicultural curriculum materials has been provided to a multiplicity of institutions: regional educational laboratories; education service centres; and school districts. Despite limitations of the national policies enacted in the Bilingual Education Programs and Ethnic Heritage Studies Programs, it cannot be denied that these national policies have been successfully implemented. This situation contrasts with comparative developments in Australia where the major effort has been placed upon developing and implementing curriculum materials for multicultural education programs whilst similar initiatives for bilingual-bicultural education have been neglected.

1.2.2.2 Australia

The reasons for developing bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education in Australia have been similar to those given for the United States of America, although Australian developments have not been accompanied by the same degree of legislative action. Instead, initiatives have usually

.... 13

occurred in response to governmental inquiries and subsequent reports. These governmental inquiries and reports are briefly discussed below.

The first significant inquiries and reports, the Department of Education (1975) and Department of Education (1976), stressed the need to implement programs for second languages and multicultural education that were appropriate to the needs of both migrant and Anglo-Australian groups. In response to the Commonwealth Schools Commission (1975), funding of multicultural education through the Child Migrant Education Program commenced in 1976. The Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants (1978) recommended the establishment of a committee, the federally sponsored Committee on Multicultural Education, to advise the Commonwealth Schools Commission upon the distribution of funds to the Multicultural Education Program through state multicultural education co-ordinating committees. This structure is likely to alter, becoming the Australian Community Languages and Culture Program, as forecast by the Commonwealth Schools Commission (1985). It is proposed that the Australian Community Languages and Culture Program will incorporate the Multicultural Education Program and the insertion class element of the Ethnic Schools Program, and place greater emphasis upon bilingual-bicultural education.

The Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (1980; 1982) reports that there have been few initiatives in bilingual-bicultural education in Australia. Programs have been restricted to aboriginal Australians in the Northern Territory (Northern Territory Department of Education, 1985), Italians in South Australia, Greeks (Zangalis, 1980) and Italians in Victoria, and Vietnamese and Italians in Western Australia. Community

....14

language programs which include both second language studies, of a less demanding nature than bilingual education, and cultural contents, are common in Australia. These programs are intended for children of both non-English speaking and Anglo-Australian backgrounds. In Australia, multicultural education has concentrated upon imparting concepts and values, and transmitting knowledge about migration and ethnic studies. There have been few efforts to establish multiethnic education in Australia.

The limited extent of implementation of bilingual-bicultural programs in Australia has affected and restricted the development of curriculum materials for such programs. The major responsibility for developing curriculum materials within the Multicultural Education Program has been undertaken by the Curriculum Development Centre. The Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (1980) has critised the role of preparing materials performed by the Curriculum Development Centre, indicating that most of the small production of bilingual-bicultural materials has occurred in conjunction with state departments of education. The production of curriculum materials by the Curriculum Development Centre has supplemented the Language Teaching Branch of the federal Department of Education's production of English-as-a-second-language materials within the Child Migrant Education Program. Because of limited co-ordination in the past between these two bodies and their failure to respond to local needs, the Commonwealth Schools Commission (1985) has indicated that greater emphasis will in future be placed upon co-operative development of bilingual-bicultural materials on a decentralised basis.

....15

1.2.3 Conclusion

The preceding discussion indicates that several important factors - the characteristics of textbook adoption procedures, the characteristics of quality in curriculum materials, the types of research methodologies providing information about curriculum materials, the application of learner-based verification and revision to curriculum materials, definition of responsibility for learning resulting from curriculum materials, and specification of the rights of interest groups to determine the materials to be used - have influenced practices in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials. The discussion also identified that problems within these factors, which are proving particularly resistant to solution, are presently constraining improvement in the quality of the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials. It can be concluded that the natures of these factors are particularly significant in fashioning the forms of curriculum development and implementation of any teacher education program to improve the quality of both the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials.

The discussion about specific flaws in curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education, such as biases, suggested that attention to the selection and the evaluation of materials in these fields is imperative. The comparative study of activities in the United States of America and Australia indicated that serious attention has only been given by educational authorities in the United States to providing facilities and training of personnel for the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education.

....16

2. SELECTION AND EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM MATERIALS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE

The author conducted a review of research through a systematic search of several of the information systems related to education. These were the *Resources in Education* and the *Current Index to Journals in Education* databases, compiled by the Educational Resources Information Center, Washington, D.C., the *British Education Index*, compiled by the British Library Bibliographic Services Division, and the *Australian Education Index*, compiled by The Australian Council for Educational Research, Hawthorn, Victoria, Australia.

Annotations of research, stored in these computerised information retrieval systems, consist of two forms: firstly, current research findings, project and technical reports, speeches, unpublished manuscripts and books, which, with a few exceptions entered in the *Australian Education Index*, are restricted to the *Resources in Education* database; and secondly, journal articles compiled in the *Current Index to Journals in Education* database, the *British Education Index* and the *Australian Education Index*. These two forms of research are listed separately in the appendices, and the discussions of the results of each part of the search, are treated independently.

The purpose of the search was threefold: to identify and document activities occurring within the field of interest; to survey the extent of activities within the field; and, most importantly, to draw upon these activities to extend the scope of research conducted in this project.

The search was directed toward identifying three types of research relevant to the topic: general developments in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials that do not specifically relate to particular subject areas; general developments that relate to teacher education in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials; and developments in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education, multicultural education and related areas. Research that related to the evaluation of bias in curriculum materials has been included in the latter section. Since both bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education have been frequently implemented through an integrated approach across subject areas of the curriculum, specific limits were not placed upon restricting the search to particular subject areas. The criterion applied to selecting research for inclusion in the appendices, was that the research was judged to relate to bilingual-bicultural education or multicultural education.

2.1 Non-journal Works

2.1.1 *Resources in Education*

2.1.1.1 The Procedures

The search through the annotated index in the *Resources in Education* database, was conducted manually and included the period between the establishment of the database in November 1966 and December 1985. A total of 158 documents indexed in the *Resources in Education* database were identified and are listed in Appendix 2. The documents are listed alphabetically by author, followed by the publication date, document title, publishing location, publisher, and the E.R.I.C. accession number.

....18

The manual search was conducted through the Subject Index using the following descriptors: bilingual education; instructional materials; multicultural education; multicultural textbooks; reading material selection; textbook bias; textbook evaluation; and textbook selection. Initially, identification was made on the basis of the relevance of each document's title, and then, in each case, recourse was taken to examining relevant abstracts indexed in the Main Entry section. It was possible to accept or reject each document for inclusion in Appendix 2 on the basis of the description provided in the abstract satisfying a specific criterion. This criterion specified that the document included subject matter that related substantially to the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials, including the evaluation of bias. The documents identified and selected, were then classified for indexing in Appendix 2 according to the three types of research previously described.

2.1.1.2 The Results

Annotations of research about selecting and evaluating curriculum materials that have been entered in the *Resources in Education* database, represent an infinitesimal proportion of its total entries. The 158 documents represent 0.06% of a total of 250,173 documents (ED 010 000 through ED 260 172) indexed in the *Resources in Education* database during this period. Among the 158 documents, 67 related to research about general developments in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials, 10 related to research about teacher education in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials, and 81 related to research about selecting and evaluating curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education, multicultural education and related areas.

An examination of the total number of documents for each year of publication reveals an increasing trend, peaking in 1976, in the absolute number of documents published in the field. Thereafter, a decreasing trend in the absolute number of documents published in the field is recorded. A similar picture is reflected within the two predominant types of research within the field. This information is shown in Table 1.

Table 2 shows the distribution of the sample on the basis of the year of indexing in the *Resources in Education* database, together with the total number of entries in this database. A chi-square test was performed in order to test whether the distribution of the sample by year of indexing was significantly different from the distribution for all entries in the *Resources in Education* database. The value of chi-square was 25.08 at 17 degrees of freedom. Failing to reach a probability of 27.587, this result was not significant at the .05 level. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for large samples was also performed to test the same frequency distributions between the sample and the population. Once the largest difference, .08, was obtained, a two-tail test was applied, providing a probability for significance of .108 at the .05 level. Since the largest difference was not equal to, or greater than, .108, the result was not significant. Both tests indicated that the distribution of the sample was not significantly different from any randomly drawn sample from the population of entries in the *Resources in Education* database.

One hundred and forty-seven (93.0%) of the contributions in this field to the *Resources in Education* database, originated from sources in the United States of America. Of the remainder, six documents (3.8%) came

...20

Table 1: Documents indexed in E.R.I.C., *Resources in Education*, by Year of Publication

Year	General		Teacher education		Bilingual, multicultural		Total	
	nos.	%age	nos.	%age	nos.	%age	nos.	%age
1963	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6
1964	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6	1	0.6
1965	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6	1	0.6
1966	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1967	1	0.6	0	0.0	2	1.3	3	1.9
1968	2	1.3	0	0.0	2	1.3	4	2.5
1969	4	2.5	0	0.0	4	2.5	8	5.1
1970	4	2.5	0	0.0	4	2.5	8	5.1
1971	3	1.9	0	0.0	3	1.9	6	3.8
1972	3	1.9	0	0.0	2	1.3	5	3.2
1973	5	3.2	0	0.0	5	3.2	10	6.3
1974	3	1.9	1	0.6	6	3.8	10	6.3
1975	6	3.8	2	1.3	6	3.8	14	8.9
1976	9	5.7	0	0.0	7	4.4	16	10.1
1977	2	1.3	1	0.6	9	5.7	12	7.6
1978	5	3.2	2	1.3	4	2.5	11	7.0
1979	1	0.6	0	0.0	5	3.2	6	3.8
1980	3	1.9	1	0.6	4	2.5	8	5.1
1981	4	2.5	0	0.0	5	3.2	9	5.7
1982	5	3.2	1	0.6	3	1.9	9	5.7
1983	3	1.9	0	0.0	4	2.5	7	4.4
1984	3	1.9	1	0.6	3	1.9	7	4.4
1985	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6	1	0.6
n.d.	0	0.0	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.6
Total	67	42.2	10	6.3	81	51.3	158	100.0

Table 2 : Documents indexed in E.R.I.C., *Resources in Education*, by Year of Indexing

Year	General		Teacher education		Bilingual, multicultural		Total		No. of *R.I.E.* entries
	nos.	%age	nos.	%age	nos.	%age	nos.	%age	
1966	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6	94
1967	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.9	3	1.9	2255
1968	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6	8803
1969	1	0.6	0	0.0	4	2.5	5	3.2	10453
1970	6	3.8	0	0.0	4	2.5	10	6.3	10456
1971	5	3.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.2	12330
1972	2	1.3	0	0.0	2	1.3	4	2.5	12230
1973	2	1.3	0	0.0	3	1.9	5	3.2	14167
1974	4	2.5	2	1.3	3	1.9	9	5.7	14466
1975	5	3.2	1	0.6	5	3.2	11	7.0	15341
1976	5	3.2	1	0.6	2	1.3	8	5.1	16819
1977	7	4.4	1	0.6	8	5.1	16	10.1	15271
1978	5	3.2	0	0.0	11	7.0	16	10.1	15303
1979	4	2.5	2	1.3	5	3.2	11	7.0	16756
1980	1	0.6	1	0.6	3	1.9	5	3.2	15993
1981	2	1.3	0	0.0	6	3.8	8	5.1	14934
1982	7	4.4	0	0.0	6	3.8	13	8.2	13825
1983	1	0.6	1	0.6	5	3.2	7	4.4	13627
1984	4	2.5	0	0.0	3	1.9	7	4.4	14247
1985	4	2.5	1	0.6	8	5.1	13	8.2	12803
Total	67	42.4	10	6.3	81	51.3	158	100.0	250173

from Canadian sources, three documents (1.9%) came from Australian sources, one document (0.6%) originated in India and one document (0.6%) originated in Thailand.

An analysis of American institutions responsible for contributions to the *Resources in Education* database, indicated that such contributions originated from a variety of sources. Of the 147 documents, twenty documents (13.6%) originated from universities. Of the sixteen universities contributing research, three documents originated from the City University of New York and two documents originated from The Ohio State University. Universities also contributed jointly with other institutions to research in the field. Six universities were represented in contributions to joint research; two contributions to joint research were made by the Northern Illinois University, whilst the remaining universities each contributed jointly to single documents. Both academic research and higher degree theses were represented in documents contributed by tertiary institutions.

Sixteen documents (10.9%) originated from educational research institutions. Of these contributions to the *Resources in Education* database, four documents originated from the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, four came from the Educational Testing Service, and four came from the Social Science Education Consortium.

Thirteen professional bodies were responsible for contributing seventeen documents (11.6%) to the *Resources in Education* database. Of these contributions, four documents originated from the National Council for the Teaching of English and two documents originated from the National Education Association.

...21

Three documents (2.0%) were contributed to the *Resources in Education* database by federal education agencies and commissions. Regional educational laboratories contributed three documents (2.0%), and education service centres contributed seven documents (4.8%).

Twenty-seven documents (18.4%), the largest quantity, were contributed to the *Resources in Education* database by state education departments, state education boards and state funded commissions. Education agencies from sixteen states were responsible for contributing this group of documents. Four documents were contributed by agencies based in Illinois, three by agencies based in California, and two each by agencies based in Arizona, Indiana, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio and Pennsylvania. Fifteen of these documents were statements of guidelines for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials. Two documents (1.4%) were contributed by school districts, and two documents were contributed by authorities responsible for education projects.

Papers presented at conferences constituted eighteen documents (12.2%) entered into the *Resources in Education* database. Twelve conference organisations were represented among this group, with three documents each being contributed by speakers at conferences of the American Educational Research Association and the National Council of the Teachers of English, and two documents each being contributed by speakers at conferences of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the International Reading Association.

Fourteen documents (9.5%) contributed to the *Resources in Education* database, were cooperative works between authors from universities, with a state education department and an educational research institution

...22

(0.7%), with an educational research institution (0.7%), with a state education department (1.4%), with a school district (0.7%), with an E.R.I.C. clearinghouse (0.7%), and with a publisher (0.7%). In other instances, professional bodies cooperated jointly (2.0%), also with a state education department (0.7%), and with an educational research institution (0.7%). Also, a national education agency and a publisher cooperated jointly (0.7%).

Additionally, E.R.I.C. clearinghouses, associated with other educational institutions, were responsible for four documents (2.7%). Furthermore, publishers accounted for four documents (2.7%) entered into the *Resources in Education* database. Finally, publishers were not specified for the remaining ten documents (6.8%) included in the *Resources in Education* database.

2.1.2 *Australian Education Index*

The search through the annotated index of the *Australian Education Index* was conducted manually to include the period, January 1970 through to December 1985. The procedure adopted to identify relevant documents was identical to that adopted for the search conducted in the E.R.I.C. databases. The following descriptors were used to complete the search: bilingual education; multicultural education; media selection; reading material selection; textbook bias; textbook evaluation; and textbook selection. The ten nonjournal works indexed in the *Australian Education Index* are listed alphabetically by author, followed by publication date, document title, publishing location, publisher, and accession number when this was indicated, in Appendix 5. Statistical analyses of these findings were not possible because the accession numbering system was incomplete for the period surveyed.

...23

2.2 Journal Articles

2.2.1 *Current Index to Journals in Education*

2.2.1.1 The Procedures

The search through the annotated index of the *Current Index to Journals in Education* database, was conducted manually to include the period between January 1980 and December 1985. The procedure and criteria adopted to identify relevant articles were identical to those adopted for the search conducted in the *Resources in Education* database. Once selected, however, journal articles were classified as either methodologies or studies within each of the three types of research. The articles are listed in Appendix 3, alphabetically by author, followed by publication date, article title, journal title, volume number, issue number, pagination, and E.R.I.C. accession number.

2.2.1.2 The Results

Publication of research about selecting and evaluating curriculum materials is also poorly represented in journals. A total of 73 articles, indexed in the *Current Index to Journals in Education* database during this period, were identified. They represent 0.06% of a total of 115,552 articles (EJ 207 485 through to EJ 323 036) indexed in the *Current Index to Journals in Education* during this period. Among the 73 articles, 40 related to research about general developments in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials, 1 related to research about teacher education in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials, and 32 related to research about the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education, multicultural education and related areas.

...24

Articles were contributed to 47 journals (4.5%) of a total of 1044 journals indexed in the *Current Index to Journals in Education* database during this period. An analysis of the study sample of journals and the population of journals by country of publication is presented in Table 3. On this basis, the study sample of journals represented, as a proportion of the population of journals, for the United States (4.6%), for the United Kingdom (2.2%), for Canada (8.3%), for Australia (5.0%), for France (10.0%), and for Italy (100.0%).

A chi-square test was performed to test whether the distribution of the 47 journals in the study sample by country of publication, was significantly different from the same distribution for the population of journals reviewed for entry into the *Current Index to Journals in Education* database. Because the number of journals included in the study sample published outside the United States was particularly small, two cells, in addition to a cell containing the data for the United States, contained, in the first case, data from countries seemingly overrepresented in the study sample, and in the second case, countries seemingly underrepresented in the study sample. The value of chi-square was 6.03 at 2 degrees of freedom. Reaching a probability of 5.99, this result was significant at the .05 level.

The chi-square test indicated that the contribution from countries, seemingly overrepresented in the study sample, was statistically significant when compared to the remaining countries. From this group of countries, comprising Canada, France, Italy and Australia, journals published by Canadian sources evidently predominated in this group. It could be conjectured that the geographical proximity of the Canadian sources to American activities in this field, explained the significantly greater

... 25

Table 3. Journals indexed in E.R.I.C., *Current Index to Journals in Education*, by population and Study Sample, January 1980 through to December 1985.

Country	Study Sample		Population	
	nos.	%	nos.	%
Australia	1	2.1	20	1.9
Belgium	0	0.0	3	0.3
Canada	3	6.4	36	3.5
Eire	0	0.0	1	0.1
Fiji	0	0.0	1	0.1
Finland	0	0.0	1	0.1
France	1	2.1	10	0.9
Germany, Federal Republic	0	0.0	8	0.8
Ghana	0	0.0	1	0.1
Hungary	0	0.0	1	0.1
India	0	0.0	3	0.3
Iran	0	0.0	2	0.2
Italy	1	2.1	1	0.1
Jamaica	0	0.0	1	0.1
Japan	0	0.0	2	0.2
Malaysia	0	0.0	1	0.1
Netherlands	0	0.0	7	0.7
Nigeria	0	0.0	1	0.1
Norway	0	0.0	1	0.1
Romania	0	0.0	1	0.1
Singapore	0	0.0	1	0.1
Spain	0	0.0	2	0.2
Switzerland	0	0.0	3	0.3
United Kingdom	2	4.3	93	8.9
United States	39	84.0	841	80.6
TOTAL	47	100.0	1044	100.0

number of Canadian journals publishing articles in this field. On the other hand, the contribution from countries, seemingly underrepresented in the study sample, was statistically significant when compared to the remaining countries. This group comprised the United Kingdom, together with the remaining countries (mainly European and developing countries) contributing journals to the population but whose journals failed to publish articles in this field. It could be conjectured that statistically significant underrepresentation of publication of journal articles in this field indicated that sources in these countries were isolated from current activities in the field. Although the number of journals from American sources publishing articles in this field was proportionally greater than the contribution of American journals to the population, the American contribution failed to add significantly to the chi-square test. Despite publications of articles in American journals contributing to the bulk of published research in the field, it could be conjectured that these publications were restricted to a small proportion of journals. The publications concentrated in these journals were apparently muted by the activities of the plethora of journals that characterise the American situation.

Table 4 shows the number of articles identified in each of the 47 journals for each year of publication. An examination of the 73 articles showed that 62 articles (84.9%) were published in the United States, 5 articles (6.8%) were published in Canada, 2 articles (2.7%) each were published in Australia and the United Kingdom, and one article (1.4%) each was published in France and Italy. Table 5 indicates the number of articles according to the year of indexing in the *Current Index to Journals in Education* database.

... 26

Table 4: Articles indexed in E.R.I.C., *Current Index to Journals in Education*, by Journal and Year of Publication.

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	TOTAL
Academic Therapy					1				1
American Education					1				1
American Educator: The Professional Journal of the American Federation of Teachers						1	1		2
American School Board Journal			1				1		2
Australian Journal of Reading				2					2
Business Education Forum						1			1
Catholic Library World					1				1
Clearing House				1					1
Contemporary Education			1						1
Curriculum Review				3					3
Drexel Library Quarterly	1								1
Education Canada				1					1
Education 3-13				1					1
Educational Communication and Technology			1	1					2
Educational Leadership				1			1	3	5
Educational Technology			2					1	3
Elements: Translating Theory into Practice		1							1
ELT Journal						1			1
English Journal						1			1
Executive Educator				1					1
Francais dans le Monde							1		1
G/C/T				1			1		2
History & Social Science Teacher				1	1	1			3
Illinois School Research and Development			1						1
Instructor				1					1
Journal of College Science Teaching							1		1
Journal of Learning Disabilities		1							1
Journal of Negro Education		1		1					2
Journal of Reading				1	2	1	1		5
Journal of Social Studies Research							1		1
Journal of Special Education Technology					1				1
Measurement & Evaluation in Counselling and Development								1	1

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	TOTA
Momentum					1				1
NABE: The Journal for the National Association for Bilingual Education		1				2			3
Nurse Educator				1					1
Phi Delta Kappan			1						1
Pointer			1						1
Principal					1				1
Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata			1						1
Reading Horizons				1					1
Reading Improvement					1				1
Roeper Review					1				1
Social Studies			1		2	1			4
Teaching Exceptional Children		1							1
Technological Horizons in Education			2						2
Tennessee Education				1					1
Today's Education			1						1
Total Numbers	1	5	13	19	12	10	8	5	73
Total Percentage	1.4	6.8	17.8	26.0	16.4	13.7	11.0	6.8	100.0

Table 5: Articles indexed in E.R.I.C., *Current Index to Journals in Education*, by Year of Indexing

	General		Teacher education		Bilingual, multicultural		Total		No. of *C.I.J.E.* entries
	nos.	%age	nos.	%age	nos.	%age	nos.	%age	
1980	7	9.6	0	0.0	6	8.2	13	17.8	21751
1981	7	9.6	0	0.0	6	8.2	13	17.8	21428
1982	11	15.1	0	0.0	8	11.0	19	26.0	17213
1983	5	6.8	1	1.4	6	8.2	12	16.4	18324
1984	2	2.7	0	0.0	2	2.7	4	5.5	18836
1985	8	11.0	0	0.0	4	5.5	12	16.4	18000
Total	40	54.8	1	1.4	32	43.8	73	100.0	115552

2.2.2 *Australian Education Index*

2.2.2.1 The Procedures

The search through the *Australian Education Index* was conducted manually to include the period January 1980 through to December 1985. The procedures adopted to identify and list relevant articles in the appendix were identical to those adopted for the search conducted in the *Current Index to Journals in Education* database. The articles are listed in Appendix 6, alphabetically by author, followed by publication date, article title, journal title, volume number, issue number, pagination, and *Australian Education Index* volume number and the accession number for the year of entry.

2.2.2.2 The Results

Publication of research about selecting and evaluating curriculum materials also appears to be poorly represented in journals indexed in the *Australian Education Index.* A total of 21 articles, indexed during the period covered by the search, were identified. Again, comparative analysis of these entries against total entries in the *Australian Education Index* was not possible. Although an accession numbering system had been introduced for indexing entries during the period of this search, non-journal documents are also included among the numbered entries. Among the 21 articles, 9 articles related to general developments in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials, 1 article related to teacher education for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials, an 11 articles related to research about the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education, multicultural education and related areas.

Table 6 shows the number of articles identified in each of the 18 journals

...27

Table 6: Articles indexed in the *Australian Education Index*, by Journal and Year of Publication.

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	TOTAL
Australian Administration						1			1
Australian Journal of Adult Education							1		1
Australian Journal of Early Childhood		1							1
Australian Journal of Reading				2					2
Australian Journal of Remedial Education		1							1
Curriculum Perspectives						2			2
Education Library Service Bulletin						1			1
English in Australia					1	1			2
Journal of Curriculum Studies								1	1
Journal of the School Library Association of Queensland							1		1
Multicultural Education Newsletter								1	1
Orana				1					1
Polycom			1						1
Reading Around				1					1
Study of Society		1							1
Teaching of English				1					1
VAT		1							1
Wikaru						1			1
Total Numbers		4	1	5	1	6	2	2	21
Total Percentage		19.0	4.8	23.8	4.8	28.6	9.5	9.5	100.0

These 18 journals represented 10.1% of a total number, averaging at 178.5 journals per annum, indexed in the *Australian Education Index* during the six-year period of the search. An examination of the 18 journals by country of publication indicated that 17 journals (94.4%) were published in Australia, whilst the one remaining journal (5.6%) was published in the United Kingdom. On this basis, an examination of the 21 journal articles showed that 20 (95.2%) were published in Australia and one (4.8%) was published in the United Kingdom.

2.2.3 *British Education Index*

2.2.3.1 The Procedures

The search through the *British Education Index* was conducted manually to include the period, January 1980 through to December 1985. The procedure adopted to identify relevant articles varied from the searches conducted in the other information retrieval systems, because subject headings were constructed through a differently structured classification, the Preserved Context Index System. The unavailability of a thesaurus of terms required the searcher to scan the subject index, to identify those descriptors most likely to contain entries related to the field of interest. The following descriptors were selected as being the most relevant to the field: bilingual education; multicultural education; teaching materials; and textbooks. Identification was made on the basis of the relevance of minor descriptors and the relevance of each article's title. Although it was not possible to accept or reject articles with the same precision that occurred with the E.R.I.C. entries, the inclusion of articles in the appendix was based upon the same criterion used for inclusion of documents and articles from the E.R.I.C. databases. This criterion

... 28

specified that the document included subject matter that related substantially to selecting and evaluating curriculum materials, including the evaluation of bias. Once selected, these journal articles were classified as either methodologies or studies within each type of research. The articles are listed in Appendix 4, alphabetically by author, followed by publication date, article title, journal title, volume number, pagination, and *British Education Index* volume number and pagination for the description of the entry.

2.2.3.2 The Results

Again, publication of research about selecting and evaluating curriculum materials appears to be poorly represented in journals indexed in the *British Education Index*. A total of 13 articles, indexed during the period covered by the search, were identified. However, comparative analysis of these entries against the total entries in the *British Education Index* was not possible because an accession numbering system is not used for indexing entries. Among the 13 articles, 4 related to general developments in the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials, and 9 related to research about the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education, multicultural education and related areas.

Table 7 shows the number of articles identified in each of the 10 journals. for each year of publication. These 10 journals represented 3.4% of a total number, averaging at 293.5 journals per annum, indexed in the *British Education Index* during the six-year period of the search. An analysis of the 10 journals by country of publication indicated that 9 journals (90.0%) were published in the United Kingdom, and 1 journal (10.0%) was published in Belgium. An examination of the 13 journal

... 29

Table 7: Articles indexed in the *British Education Index*, by Journal and Year of Publication.

	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	TOTAL
Education 3-13				1					1
English Language Teaching Journal			1			1			2
European Journal of Education			1						1
Journal Association of Teachers of Italian					2				2
Journal of Curriculum Studies								1	1
Links				1					1
School Librarian				1			1		2
Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis						1			1
Signal					1				1
Teaching Geography						1			1
Total Numbers			2	3	3	3	1	1	13
Total Percentage			15.4	23.1	23.1	23.1	9.7	9.7	100.0

articles showed that 12 (92.3%) were published in the United Kingdom and 1 (7.7%) was published in Belgium.

2.3 Discussion

An analysis of the literature, identified from the information systems, allows certain conclusions to be drawn about characteristic features of the research in this field. These features include interpretations derived from both statistical analyses of quantitative data and inferences made about the sources of the research. No attempt has been made to provide qualitative judgments about the research that has been conducted.

Five conclusions can be drawn from the statistical analyses of research in this field. Firstly, such research is poorly represented, at generally less than one percent, among all educational research. Secondly, the generic- and the subject-oriented types of research accounted for the most substantial part of research conducted whilst research that related to teacher education has been particularly neglected. Thirdly, no statistically significant difference was determined between the trend for research conducted in this field and the trend for all educational research indexed in the *Resources in Education* database. Fourthly, articles indexed in the *Current Index to Journals in Education*, the *Australian Education Index* and the *British Education Index* during the period of the search, had been published by only a small minority, generally less than ten percent, of educational journals. Finally, a significant difference was found between the quantity of publication of articles by journals in different countries as represented by articles reviewed for entry in the *Current Index to Journals in Education*.

... 30

Although the author has concentrated upon presenting analyses of quantitative data in this chapter, qualitative interpretations have been made about the documents indexed in the *Resources in Education* database. This aspect of the analysis indicated that the documents originated from diverse educational sources that represented all types of educational institutions. Publication of documents in this field, however, was concentrated in certain educational institutions: particular universities; particular educational research institutions; particular professional organisations; state education departments; and conference organisations which were usually linked to professional organisations. In contrast, proportionally less research emanated from federal educational agencies including research and development centres and regional educational laboratories, education service centres, school districts and educational projects.

2.4 Conclusion

The findings from the analysis of the literature in this field generally supported the hypothesis for conducting the search. The purpose of the search was to identify and document activities occurring within the field of interest, to survey the extent of activities occurring within the field, and to draw upon these activities to extend the scope of the proposal for a teacher education program presented in this paper.

The analysis of the literature in this field identified the characteristic features of this research. These features were established by interpreting statistical analyses of quantitative data about research in this field and deriving inferences about the sources of the research. Furthermore, certain types of educational institutions were identified for being reponsible for contributing a greater proportion of research in this field. It could be inferred that the American institutions - the Social Science

... 31

Education Consortium and the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute - were the predominant forces in conducting activities in this field. To this extent, conclusions derived from the search verified the selection of the institutions discussed in Chapter 3.

The search also provided a basis for extending the scope of the proposal for a teacher education program presented in Chapter 4. Although the quantity of teacher education modules identified through the search was small, and they varied considerably in their quality, taken together their statements of objectives, contents, activities, and means for assessment, provided a helpful basis for extending and validating the proposal.

... 32

3. REVIEW OF INSTITUTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Institutional activities in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials are not extensive. A comparative survey of such activities has been undertaken by Eraut *et al.* (1975). Seven evaluative instruments were identified from the following sources: Social Science Education Consortium, Boulder, Colorado, U.S.A. (1968); Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California, U.S.A. (1970); Eash (1972); Educational Resource Centre, St. Gallen Canton, Switzerland (1972); Institüt für die Pedagogik der Naturwissenschaften, University of Kiel, German Federal Republic (1973); National Board of Education, Stockholm, Sweden (1974); and the Centre for Educational Technology, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom (1975).

A basic criterion is defined by Eraut *et al.* as fitting each of these instruments: providing an organised set of techniques that can be applied to the evaluation of the characteristics of curriculum materials. The authors have distinguished three functions which these instruments fulfil to greater or lesser extents: descriptive analysis; evaluation; and decision-making. Descriptive analysis stresses not only description of curriculum materials but also concentrates upon elucidating their rationale and structure. Evaluation provides the capability to judge curriculum materials against a range of criteria. Decision-making provides judgments allowing users to select and implement curriculum materials .

Only the instruments developed by Eash, and later adapted for extensive use by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, and the

... 33

Centre for Educational Technology are designed for general use. The majority of these instruments are subject-specific: the instrument developed at the Social Science Education Consortium was designed for social studies; the instrument developed at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, for elementary science; the instrument developed at the Educational Resource Centre, for elementary mathematics; the instrument developed at the Institüt für die Pedagogik der Naturwissenschaften, for science; and the instrument developed at the National Board of Education, for secondary mathematics. Such subject-specific characteristics, however, have had little influence upon the major features of each instrument since such characteristics are almost entirely confined to details.

Attention in this chapter, however, will only be given to those instruments applicable to general use, to subject-specific use for bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education and related areas, and to application in teacher education. Those instruments related to mathematics and the sciences will not receive further consideration in this paper. Discussion will concentrate upon the instrument developed by the Social Science Education Consortium because of its application to the evaluation of curriculum materials for multicultural education. The instrument developed at the Centre for Educational Technology, and adaptations used by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute of the instrument developed by Eash, will be considered because of applicability to general use. In each case, particular attention will be given to developments in teacher education. Developed independently of the previous activities are a small number of instructional guides which provide teacher education in the skills of selecting and evaluating curriculum materials. These

... 34

guides will be discussed in the latter part of this chapter.

3.1 Social Science Education Consortium

The Social Science Education Consortium was established during 1963-1964 at the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado. Its aims are to collect and disseminate materials for social studies education, to support development and implementation of new social studies materials and to improve working relationships between personnel in various social studies education projects.

3.1.1 The Process for Selecting Curriculum Materials

Davis and Eckenrod (1972) provide an account of procedures recommended by the Social Science Education Consortium for selecting curriculum materials for social studies. Two major steps are involved in this process: firstly, a statement of broad program goals, such as the guidelines developed by the National Council for the Social Studies, can be used to identify available curriculum materials; and secondly, evaluation of curriculum materials that appear to support the program goals by use of the Social Science Education Consortium's *Curriculum Materials Analysis System.*

3.1.2 The Evaluation Instrument

Morrissett *et al.* (1968) report the development of an instrument to evaluate curriculum materials. The instrument originated informally as a brief form containing a dozen or so questions. This form was revised and enlarged on several occasions but was first formally applied as part of activities

... 35

undertaken with the Wabash Valley Education Center, Indiana, early in 1966. The original version of this instrument, published by Morrissett and Stevens (1967), comprised the following sections: 1.0 Descriptive Characteristics; 2.0 Rationale and Objectives; 3.0 Antecedent Conditions; 4.0 Content; 5.0 Instructional Theory and Teaching Strategies; and 6.0 Overall Judgments. No sooner had this original version of the *Curiculum Materials Analysis System* been published than an initial revised version was published (Stevens and Morrissett, 1967-1968; Stevens and Fetsko, 1968). This version was the result of reworkings conducted at conferences sponsored by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute at Lake Mohonk, New York in 1966 and at Purdue University in April 1967. Further reworkings of the instrument also occurred as a result of a conference held at the University of Colorado in May 1968, and of criticisms and suggestions for revision contributed by Charles Adair, Frances Klein, Michael Scriven, Hilda Taba and Louise Tyler. In May 1971, a second revised version of the instrument (Social Science Education Consortium, 1971) was published, containing short, intermediate and long forms, and including two additional sections. This version was arranged as follows: 1.0 Product Characteristics; 2.0 Rationale and Objectives; 3.0 Content; 4.0 Theory and Strategies; 5.0 Antecedent Conditions; 6.0 Evaluation; 7.0 Background of Materials Development; and 8.0 Background of the Analysis. Analyses of social studies curriculum materials undertaken by the Social Science Education Consortium, using a two-page framework derived from the *Curriculum Materials Analysis System*, are published in successive editions of the *Social Studies Curriculum Materials Data Book.*

Eraut *et al.* have provided a critique of Morrissett and Stevens. They

... 36

indicate that this instrument employs an objectives model of the curriculum. Theoretical considerations characterise the instrument. In their analysis, they state that this instrument combines analytical and descriptive features whilst incorporating a separate evaluation section.

The Social Science Education Consortium has also undertaken a major role in the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials for the Ethnic Heritage Studies Program. The *Curriculum Materials Analysis System* was adapted for use in the Ethnic Heritage Studies Curriculum Materials project that commenced in July 1974. This instrument (Social Science Education Consortium, 1975) comprises two parts: firstly, an extended form; and secondly, a short form compiled from the third and fifth sections of the extended form. The short form is intended for classroom teacher use in the evaluation of curriculum materials or as a tool for demonstration at teacher education workshops. Four of the five sections of the extended form deal with the educational qualities of curriculum materials: 1.0 Product Characteristics; 2.0 General Educational Quality of Materials; 4.0 Adaptability of Materials to Conditions of Use; and 5.0 Overall Evaluation. The third section, 3.0 Ethnic Heritage Content, concentrates upon the treatment of ethnic groups in terms of stereotyping, realism, accuracy and development of intercultural understanding. Except for the section, Product Characteristics, of the extended form, items within both forms of this instrument are based upon a six-point rating scale.

3.1.3 Applications to Teacher Education

The authors cite eight possible uses of this instrument (Morrissett *et al.*): general library use; analysis of trends within curriculum materials;

field data collection about classroom use of curriculum materials; decision-making in the selection of new curriculum materials; provision of analyses of curriculum materials in terms of a curriculum model; promotion of all dimensions of curriculum development; introduction of new ideas and approaches in curriculum materials through inservice education; and acquainting preservice teacher trainees with the range of curriculum materials and the ability to perform their own analyses.

Application of several of these uses, including inservice education, have been reported by Morrissett *et al.* and Davis and Eckenrod. Use of the *Curriculum Materials Analysis System* in teacher education has been applied not only to developing skills of teachers in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials but also to stimulating teacher involvement in curriculum philosophy and to constructing curriculum models. Davis and Eckenrod report that the *Curriculum Materials Analysis System* has been used in workshops, conferences and academic programs throughout the United States of America. Morrissett *et al.* report that the *Curriculum Materials Analysis System* was used for training purposes at the 1966-1967 Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program at Purdue University and the 1968-1969 Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program in Economic Education at the University of Colorado. Davis and Eckenrod report that the *Curriculum Materials Analysis System* has been applied to inservice teacher education in Team Regional Inservice Analysis and Dissemination projects which aimed to assist school districts engaged in selecting new social studies curriculum materials. Using this instrument, teachers and supervisors in different school districts undertook analyses of materials available for purchase and then shared their results with other members of their group and with groups in other school districts.

... 38

3.2 Educational Products Information Exchange Institute

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute was established as an independent organisation on 1 August 1967, although formerly operating as a division of the Institute of Educational Development. Komoski (1967) has detailed planning for the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute during the formative years of its development.

> "Plans and procedures include meetings between users and producers of equipment to discuss what characteristics of 'hardware' need be described to permit informed selection. Professionals at two universities have devised procedures for analyzing content and explicating the pedagogical assumptions underlying the make-up of instructional materials. Interview protocols for use with teachers have been devised and tested, as have methods for training school personnel to use EPIE information collection techniques. A pilot study of the entire system has been designed, and a preliminary version of a comprehensive systems design for the Exchange has been completed and is being revised in preparation for the proposed pilot study" (1).

This pilot study aimed to establish a national system to collect, evaluate and disseminate information about educational products to all sections of the educational community. Today, the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute operates in both the United States of America and Canada, maintaining Executive Offices at Water Mill, New York, a Program Development and Research Office at the Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, whilst a Western Projects Office is located at Berkeley, California and a Northeastern Projects Office is situated at Dresden, Maine.

The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute is currently involved in selecting and evaluating textbooks, audiovisual and video equipment, microcomputer hardware and software, and in disseminating information about these educational products through printed reports and computerised databases. Komoski (personal communication, 1986) reports that the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute operates "education's largest database of information on microcomputer software, which is widely used by schools throughout the U.S.A. and Canada for selecting software. This database, The Educational Software Selector (TESS) is also used to produce a hardcopy 'software encyclopaedia' published annually by the EPIE Institute and the Teachers College Press". Another database, termed the Integrated Instructional Information Resource (IIIR), is now being developed to provide Curriculum Alignment Services for Educators. The Curriculum Alignment Services for Educators are aimed at improving school performance by ensuring that all educational products --- textbooks, supplementary materials, computerised software programs, videotapes and tests --- are carefully aligned with a school's chosen curriculum objectives.

3.2.1 The Process for Selecting Curriculum Materials

Selection of instructional materials by committees is advocated by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute. Selection committees should be based locally and should consist of administrators, teachers, parents, students and other members of the community. Systematic training of committee members is viewed as essential. Selection involves determining prospective users for particular instructional materials and is governed by the instructional design of the materials and the characteristics of the setting in which the materials will be used.

Sequential steps to be taken by selection committees are to review and examine available materials within a field of interest through the use of checklists and rating scales. Then, selection committees screen these

...40

materials by means of appraisal forms based upon cooperatively agreed-upon criteria related to both the materials and the appropriate instructional setting. Komoski (personal communication) reports that "recently, EPIE has added the use of computer-generated curriculum alignment reports as an important element to be used in the screening process". On the basis of this screening, selection or production of materials can be made within a 'decision arena' of five alternative courses used alone or in combination: continued use of existing materials within existing programs; selection of materials on the bases of learner and teacher characteristics and approach to instruction; development of materials locally, regionally, or at a state level; initiation of inservice training of personnel in the use of materials and implementation of programs; and initiation of broader curriculum development for the appropriate programs.

3.2.2 The Evaluation Instrument

The instruments used by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute to evaluate educational products are adaptations of an original instrument published by Eash (1972). Eash's instrument contains five sections: I Objectives; II Organization; III Methodology; IV Evaluation; and V Comment. Eraut *et al.* have criticised Eash's instrument, labelling it a behaviourist, goal-based model of curriculum development. They state that this instrument combines description with analysis in only a limited way in relation to objectives, organisation of the material, methodology and evaluation. Stressing evaluation, this instrument merges evaluation with descriptive analysis but fails to provide users with decision-making information.

Following adaptation by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute of Eash's instrument, Elliott (personal communication, 1985) has reported that the first version of EPIEform A was developed in response to feedback from participants at a workshop in which Eash assisted the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute train teachers in California to use his instrument to analyse textbook programs in reading. The fundamental alterations that occurred in the transition from Eash's instrument to EPIEform A are best related in Elliott's words.

> "The main issue that led to the feedback and the revision focused on whether EPIE analyses should favor some specific instructional design provisions over others or simply describe the provisions made in each set of materials and leave it to the selector to express preferences. In the Eash instrument with which we started the training in Los Angeles, analysts were asked to rate a number of instructional design features on a scale of ten (e.g., fully stated 'behavioral' objectives were given the highest rating and very general outcome statements the lowest). In the EPIEform A version that emerged from these sessions, analysts were asked to describe each instructional design provision as precisely as possible (e.g., Objectives give check all that apply : a. expected behavior/s, b. conditions under which it/they should occur, c. performance standard, d. other _______).
>
> The original Eash instrument was based on a single point of view about what constitutes good instruction; EPIEform A allowed for alternative views and stressed making a good match between: (1) user needs and preferences and (2) one or more of a number of different approaches built into the sets of materials available on the market..."

The purposes of EPIEform A have been to provide useful information for users and guidance about the selection of educational products. A significant feature of this instrument has been its capacity for adaptation to different educational contexts and for revision based upon criticisms received from educators who use EPIE Reports. During 1984, major revisions were undertaken to the version of EPIEform A applied to the analysis of textbooks (Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, 1985). This revised version comprises four sections: Contents (scope, content organisation, and other content considerations); Methodology (typical lesson/learning approach, levels/types of thinking in learning activities, provision for extension/enrichment activities

...42

and comment on methodology); Tests and Assessment (description of provisions, comments on tests and assessment); and Other Considerations (program implementation, technical quality of program materials, summary and goodness of fit, analyst's summary comment). As a result of these changes, Elliott indicates that "future EPIE Reports will contain more critical comments about such matters as the clarity of learning activity instructions and the 'considerateness' of the text narrative, while maintaining neutrality concerning instructional approaches or philosophies".

3.2.3 Applications to Teacher Education

The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute has been active in teacher education since 1973-1974, when a program to train teachers in analysing instructional materials was introduced in Pennsylvania and California, and was later extended to other states and Canada --- the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia and Manitoba (Wood, 1981). For this purpose, EPIE training Form I was published (Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, 1977). This instrument is designed for either class use or self-instruction. The instrument is a variant of EPIEform A, which was being used at that time to analyse curriculum materials. EPIE training Form I comprises the following parts: I Product Identification and Background; II Instructional Design Constructs (A. The First Instuctional Design Construct: Intents, B. The Second Instructional Design Construct: Contents, C. The Third Instructional Design Construct: Methodology, D. The Fourth Instructional Design Construct: Means of Evaluation); III Instructional Design Fit; and IV Other Considerations (Content Authenticity: Accuracy, Fairness, and Currency). EPIE training Form I specifies a set of common criteria on which trainees must base their descriptive, analytical and evaluative comments about a

...43

analytic process, and examples of statements for each design construct are appended.

Komoski (personal communication) reports that "in 1981-1982, the EPIE Institute designed an instrument for evaluating microcomputer software. It was developed by the EPIE Office of Research at Teachers College, Columbia University. Since its initial development, it has undergone four revisions, all of which reflect new levels of development in the evaluation of computer software. The form is used by trained teams of evaluators who analyse the software's design (instructional and technical) and who also gather user data to assess a program's effectiveness".

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (n.d.) has developed a module for use in providing educators with the knowledge and skills to evaluate all types of educational materials. Two ways for determining analysis of materials are presented in the module: application of four curriculum constructs --- intents, contents, methodology and evaluation --- to provide qualitative analysis of materials; and correlating concepts, textbooks, supplementary instructional materials, computerised software programs, films, videotapes and tests to provide quantitative analysis of materials.

Qualitative analysis is presented through demonstration and discussion of six concepts: A Learning Materials Continuum; Ralph Tyler's Rationale; Educational Products Information Exchange Institute's Curriculum Analysis Framework; A Bridge 'Analogy' of the Curriculum and Instruction Process; Internal and External Curriculum Congruence; and Development of an Integrated Instructional Information Resource. Quantitative analysis focuses upon matching concepts and educational materials in Curriculum/Content/Evaluation Correlation, and linking this process to the Integrated Instructional

...44

Information Resource and its application in the Curriculum, Text, Test Matching Service, now the Curriculum Alignment Services for Educators.

The materials used at workshops, in conjunction with the module, comprise a videotape presenting Kenneth Komoski's explanation of the concepts of curriculum and instruction integrity, eleven handouts (1. 'Concepts of Curriculum and Instruction Integrity', 2a. 'Learning Materials Continuum', 2b. 'Glossary of Instructional Design Terms', 3. 'Analysis Sheet --- Flow Charts', 4. '"What Should Drive the Curriculum?" Exercise, 5. 'An Introduction to Curriculum/Content/Evaluation Correlation and Integrated Instructional Information Resource', 6. 'Analysis Sheet for Curriculum, Text, Test Matching Service Sample', 7. 'DEMO --- Curriculum, Text, Test Matching Service', 8. 'Conclusion and Debriefing of Curriculum/Content/ Evaluation Correlation', 9. 'EPIE PRO/FILE SCIENCE', 10. 'Micro-Courseware PRO/FILE-Fractions 1' and 11. 'Bibliography'), and seven transparencies for overhead projection. Handouts 1 through 4 are used in the first part of the workshop and handouts 5 through 11 are used in the second part.

The workshop is designed to run for six hours' duration over a single day with a lunch break dividing the two parts. The following sequence is used for presentation of the workshop materials. The workshop leader introduces part one, Qualitative Analysis, through a question-and-answer pre-test, 'What Should Drive the Curriculum?'. Following this introduction, the participants view the videotape, followed by presentation of Handout 1. Questions, discussion and review of this handout then proceed. The Learning Materials Continuum which refers to an arrangement, according to their intentions, of the different types of educational materials from least to greatest complexity, Ralph Tyler's Rationale, based upon a statement of the objectives model contained in his publication (Tyler, 1950)

... 45

and A 'Bridge' Analogy, which refers to the transactional relationships established between the developer of instructional materials, the curriculum process and the learner, are then introduced. Participants, then, apply these qualitative concepts to complete two exercises: a learning materials continuum exercise, using Handouts 2a and 2b, to classify a set of miscellaneous materials; and a flow chart exercise, using Handout 3, to apply Tyler's rationale, the Curriculum Analysis Framework, the 'Bridge' Analogy and Internal-External Congruence to analysing the linking of curriculum constructs in a textbook. The final section in part one is intended to answer the question, 'What Should Drive the Curriculum?'. Participants use Handout 4 to undertake two exercises describing what preferably, and then what actually, drives the curriculum.

Part two introduces qualitative analysis through examinations of curriculum/content/evaluation correlation and the Integrated Instructional Information Resource. Handout 5, designed as a cloze procedure, informs participants about how concepts, objectives of textbooks and tests are matched. Following the workshop leader's explanation, participants complete this exercise. Next, participants are informed about how the Integrated Instructional Information Resource database can be used to process such matches by indexing five subdivisions for concept development: developing the concept; reviewing the concept; practicing the concept; testing the concept; and word problems. Participants then examine more closely samples of the Text/Test Matching Service now termed the Curriculum Alignment Services for Educators. Participants then complete the questions contained on Handout 6. Once this exercise is completed, participants read Handout 7 which provides an example of application of the computerised database. Finally, conclusion and debriefing are intended to combine the important themes discussed during the workshop: curriculum/content/evaluation correlation; steps for selecting educational materials; the Educational

....46

Products Information Exchange Institute's service providing qualitative analyses of textbooks and courseware; and learner verification and revision. Participants then refer to examples of qualitative analysis of a textbook contained on Handout 9 and qualitative analysis of a microcourseware contained on Handout 10.

To counteract what are now viewed to be both inadequate procedures and the widespread use of dubious practices for textbook adoptions, the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute is promoting a utilisation policy which extends the process of adoption beyond selection of curriculum materials to their use in the classroom. A principal feature of this utilisation policy is to provide teachers with support, training, monitoring and communication with other teachers about matching curriculum materials to the capabilities of individual students. An instrument, the *Degrees of Reading Power*, based upon the Bormuth readability formula, has been developed by the New York Department of Education. The *Degrees of Reading Power* can be employed for diagnostic assessments of both students and curriculum materials.

The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (1986a) has developed a set of modules to facilitate the training of teachers in relation to the implementation of the *Degrees of Reading Power* in school districts. The modules are intended to be used in EPIE training workshops or can be used at school-based workshops.

The material consists of seven modules and an appendix: Module 1 is titled An Overview of the Degrees of Reading Power (DRP) System ... A Stand-Alone 'Awareness' Module; Module 2 is titled The Degrees of Reading Power (DRP) System Explained; Module 3 is titled Comparing the DRP System and CAT-MAT Type Reading Comprehension Tests; Module 4a and 4b is titled The DRP and

... 47

the Readability Level of Instructional Materials: Helping Teachers to Assess the Readability of Unanalyzed Materials; Module 5a and 5b is titled Creating CLOZE Exercises for Comprehension Instruction; Module 6 is titled Selecting Commercially Produced CLOZE Materials; Module 7 is titled The DRP System: Summing Up; and the appendix is titled Book Readability Measures. The organisation of the contents of each module is similar, providing statements about the module's rationale, objectives, methodology, time requirement, equipment, materials, preparation, general instructions and specific instructions. Sets of handouts are appended to each module. Sessions run for a duration of 35 to 50 minutes each.

Module 1 is intended to be used only in circumstances where the remaining modules cannot be implemented, and, as such, should be used independently. The three main concepts of the *Degrees of Reading Power* --- the assessment of students' reading ability through the use of cloze passages, the assessment of the readability of materials, and the computer-based matching of materials of appropriate difficulty to students --- are treated. Participants are presented with three handouts: The DRP System --- What is it?; Sample DRP Passage --- Drawbridge; and DRP Matching of Students and Instructional Materials.

The objectives of Module 2 are, firstly, to present the theoretical presumptions about the acquisition of reading skills that underlie the *Degrees of Reading Power*, secondly, to introduce the characteristics of the *Degrees of Reading Power* test, and thirdly, to introduce applications of the *Degrees of Reading Power* system. Prior to attending this session at a training workshop, participants are expected to complete a questionnaire and locate their students' *Degrees of Reading Power* scores. Through discussion with the workshop leader and reading, the participants

...48

examine four handouts in sequence to achieve the first objective: Handout A, Matching Students to Books with the DRP System; Handout B, A Man is Building a Boat; Handout C, Hunting; and Handout D, The Reading Process --- A Flow Chart. Participants are then informed of the characteristics of a *Degrees of Reading Power* test: that examinees must process extended prose passages, each in excess of 325 words; that the *Degrees of Reading Power* test is not a vocabulary test; and that the *Degrees of Reading Power* test is not culture-bound nor a measure of prior knowledge. The participants achieve the second objective by examining three handouts in sequence: Handout E, Bridges --- DRP Test; Handout F, 'Astronomical' Radiation --- DRP Test; and Handout G, Readability of Periodicals. During this session, participants also require copies of the original materials of the *Degrees of Reading Power* instrument: the Readability Report; the User's Manual and *Degrees of Reading Power* test form CP-1.

The objectives of Module 3 are, firstly, to compare the assumptions of the *Degrees of Reading Power* test with norm-referenced achievement test batteries (in this case, the *California Achievement Tests* and the *Metropolitan Achievement Tests*) which assess reading comprehension as a set of subskills; secondly, to discuss these differences; and thirdly, to demonstrate the reporting of the *Degrees of Reading Power* scores. Participants achieve the first objective through discussion and reading Handout A, California Achievement Reading Test Items Weighted by Subskill. The second objective is achieved through discussion about the lack of relationship between grade equivalent scores on norm-referenced tests and grade levels assigned through readability formulas. To achieve the third objective, participants read Handout B, DRP Matching of Students and Instructional Materials. This handout illustrates the computer-based matching of examinees' *Degrees of Reading Power* scores, indicated at an independent level, three instructional levels and a frustration level, with the *Degrees of Reading Power* readability ranges for textbooks.

Unlike the previous modules, Module 4 is to be presented in two sessions. The objectives of this module are to apply the *Degrees of Reading Power* readability formula to determine levels of difficulty of curriculum materials; to rank and analyse the range of prose passages using the *Degrees of Reading Power* readability formula; and to have participants practise approximating readability levels on sample prose passages. In the first session, participants use Handout A, DRP Analysis of Passage 25, to determine how a *Degrees of Reading Power* readability level of a prose passage can be obtained through measures of word length, sentence length and the proportion of 'familiar' vocabulary. By referring to Handout B, A Comparison of Publishers' Designation with 6 Readability Formulas for the Ginn Reading 720 Series, and Handout C, Readability Variations within Textbooks, participants understand that the *Degrees of Reading Power* readability formula is not used to report grade equivalent scores or average readability scores but the range of reading difficulty for curriculum materials. Using Handout D, Set of 5 DRP Paragraphs, and Handout E, Set of 4 DRP Paragraphs, participants apply this knowledge to rank prose passages according to their perceptions of each passage's difficulty. In the second session, participants use the *Degrees of Reading Power* readability formula to measure the reading levels of three prose passages containing subject matter in social studies as shown on Handout G, Social Studies Passages. Through discussion with the leader, participants use Handout H, DRP Analysis of Social Studies Passages, to check their estimations of the *Degrees of Reading Power* levels for each . passage. In conclusion, participants are asked to rank four passages of similar *Degrees of Reading Power* levels shown on Handout I, Sample Book Pages. .Participants will then understand that differences between different materials, such as illustrations, photographs and print size,

...50

provide a misleading indication of reading levels.

Module 5 is also to be presented over two sessions. The objectives of this module are to practise identifying the characteristics of effective cloze exercises and to apply these characteristics to developing cloze exercises. In the first session, participants are informed about a set of guidelines for selection and creation of cloze passages by examining examples shown on Handout A, Guidelines for Selection and Creation of Cloze Exercises. Participants then use the sample cloze passage shown on Handout B, Refining Cloze Response Options, to determine guidelines for each deletion shown in the cloze passage. Then, the participants examine Handout C, More Practice Refining Cloze Options, and provide reasons for eliminating two of the alternatives for each deletion. For Handout D, Creating Options for Cloze Exercises, the participants are asked to create their own alternatives for each deletion. In the second session, participants examine Handout E, Generative Cloze Passages, to determine which alternatives for each deletion they would perceive to be acceptable to students. Handout F, Making Good Cloze Deletions, is supplied in two editions: a participant's edition which shows no deletions; and a leader's edition which indicates seven possible deletions, each supplied with five alternatives. The participants are required to make five deletions, underline cues and supply a set of alternatives for each deletion.

The objectives of Module 6 are, firstly, to identify criteria used to select commercially produced cloze materials, and secondly, to apply these criteria to selecting cloze materials. The participants examine and discuss the criteria shown on Handout A, Criteria for Selecting Cloze Materials. The participants, then, use Handout B, Ranking Sheet, to appraise and rank available cloze materials.

...51

The objectives of Module 7 are to reinforce the topics presented in this set of modules, to discuss the instructional significance of the *Degrees of Reading Power* system, and to discuss the participants' plans to implement the *Degrees of Reading Power* system. Four issues are presented for discussion with the participants: the *Degrees of Reading Power* approach to reading; matching books to students; the *Degrees of Reading Power* and the cloze technique; and implementing the *Degrees of Reading Power*.

The appendix, Book Readability Measures, provides a reference to curriculum materials that have been analysed by the *Degrees of Reading Power* system. *Degrees of Reading Power* scores are presented for different sections of the materials and for the means of these scores. The subject areas covered consist of Language Arts and Literature, Science, and Social Studies.

The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute has also developed two sets of modules for training teachers to select and effectively use curriculum materials. The first set to be developed, the Packaged Training Workshop in Instructional Materials Selection, consists of thirty modules developed during 1978-1979. The second set comprises ten modules developed during the conduct of the Teacher Information Exchange (TIE) project in 1980-1982.

The development, field-testing and revision of the Packaged Training Workshop in Instructional Materials Selection, funded by the National Institute of Education, are reported in the final report of the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (1980). The thirty modules consist of three main groups: sixteen modules, the basic components of the set, developed, field-tested and revised during 1978-1979; four modules adapted from the first group for use with special educators, developed and later field-tested by the Wayne County Public Schools, Michigan during 1979; and ten modules developed during 1979 following empirical research conducted by the

...52

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute to gather and analyse data that indicated widespread and gross misfitting of curriculum materials to the capabilities of students. A project to disseminate the modules and train teachers was initially conducted in Illinois during 1979 and later, in 1980, extended to other states.

In 1980, the Teacher Information Exchange (TIE) project, reported in the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (1986b), was implemented for two years in a dozen elementary and junior high schools in New York City. The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute's staff worked with teachers through classroom observations, consultations, workshops and meetings to identify issues related to the use of curriculum materials in classrooms. The same teachers were provided with inservice training about how to use curriculum materials more effectively once they had been selected. An important feature of this project was to train these teachers sufficiently so that they could share their training with other teachers. To facilitate teacher education, ten modules were developed by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute and field-tested in the participating schools. These modules addressed the following issues: 1. an overview of the concept of time-on-task; 2. and 3. educational objectives; 4. and 5. a management system involving tests and record-keeping devices; 6. and 7. supplementary materials, their adaptation, and planning of worksheets; 8. classroom structure as related to using curriculum materials and learners' time-on-task; 9. pacing lessons; and 10. instituting routine in using instructional materials.

As previously mentioned, the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute is currently developing a textbook utilisation policy. This policy, reported in the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (1986c), is based upon three assumptions: firstly, that most textbooks are inadequate to promote positive classroom instruction; secondly, that most supplementary materials are similarly flawed; and thirdly, that teachers require support, training, monitoring and communication with colleagues about using curriculum materials. The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute believes that publishers should be responsible for providing teacher education for users of their publications. Such teacher education programs should comprise an overview of the instructional program inherent in the curriculum material, a demonstration of how the curriculum materials should be used with learners, and provide discussion sessions with users after the demonstration. Furthermore, this initial teacher education program should be supported by evaluations of materials to establish their comprehensibility, readability and content appropriateness. Teachers should then be supplied with this information and trained to identify matching and mismatching of curriculum materials and the curriculum process in their particular contexts. Such a teacher education program should be spaced over a period of time and a planned model should be adopted.

The conduct of both the Teacher Information Exchange (TIE) project and the development of the textbook utilisation policy indicates that greater importance and allocation of resources is being given by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute to providing effective progams in teacher education. These teacher education programs have acted to extend the scope of the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute's activities in schools as well as to support their activities to protect the consumers of educational products.

3.3 Centre for Educational Technology, University of Sussex

Between 1973 and 1975, the Centre for Educational Technology, Sussex University, Falmer, Brighton, Sussex, England, conducted a project, funded

...54

by the Volkswagen Foundation, dealing with the evaluation of curriculum materials. The activities of the project, reported in Eraut *et al.*, consisted of reading consultation at an international level and reflection, producing analyses of different materials, conducting an instructional program in curriculum analysis, and one-week workshops about the evaluation of curriculum materials.

3.3.1 The Process for Selecting Curriculum Materials

Unlike the instruments developed by the two previously mentioned institutions, the process for selecting curriculum materials is an integral function of the instrument developed by this project group. Eraut *et al.* identified three essential functions of instruments used to evaluate curriculum materials: descriptive analysis; evaluation; and decision-making. The decision-making function, of relevance in this context, provides selection and implementation decisions to users of curriculum materials.

They indicate that one of the major purposes of their instrument, the Sussex Scheme, is to provide selection evidence which will allow those considering purchase or use of curriculum materials to adopt, adapt or reject them. They argue that selectors should be presented with analyses of curriculum materials rather than being forced to decide upon the nature of the curriculum beforehand. Because selection is so closely linked to implementation, these writers believe that the last, optional section of their instrument, Decision Making in a Specific Context, should only be completed by a member of the user group.

3.3.2 The Evaluation Instrument

Eraut *et al.* indicate that they had had considerable experience in using

...55

the *Curriculum Materials Analysis System* developed by the Social Science Education Consortium to conduct analyses of curriculum materials, and had extended the application of this instrument to subjects other than social studies. Dissatisfaction with the *Curriculum Materials Analysis System* was partly responsible for their decision to develop their own instrument, termed the Sussex Scheme, which consists of five parts : 1. Introduction; 2. Description and Analysis of the Materials; 3. The Materials in Use; 4. Evaluation; and 5. Decision Making in a Specific Context, an optional part.

A characteristic feature of the Sussex Scheme is the authors' recommendation of a particular curriculum model without incorporating it within the instrument so that its use is not mandatory and can be substituted by other curriculum models. In this curriculum model the aims of a curriculum program or material are expressed in a curriculum strategy through four elements, none of which takes precedence, but operate through dynamic interaction: subject matter; objectives and outcomes; teaching, learning and communication methods; and assessment pattern. The authors argue that this allows a four-stage approach within parts 2 and 3 of the Sussex Scheme to be adopted. This allows for explicit and realistic relationships to occur between author, analyst and user.

This instrument also employs a separate evaluation section relating intents to differing standards and judgments so that the analyst is expected to express arguments both in support and in opposition to a curriculum program or material. Finally, the authors of the Sussex Scheme adopt both the selection and implementation decisions within the decision-making function so that users are presented with pertinent evaluations of curriculum materials rather than compelling them to select materials to fit a particular curriculum design chosen beforehand.

...56

3.3.3 Applications to Teacher Education

Important issues addressed in this project concerned curriculum analysis as a component of curriculum evaluation, within preservice and inservice teacher education, and curriculum criticism. An examination of the application of the curriculum analysis of materials within teacher education became a major portion within this project.

The developers resolved the conflict between providing a content analysis approach through a subject-oriented course and a separate course in curriculum studies by supporting the need for integrative roles for curriculum analysis in preservice teacher education. They reject the former approach because, in all cases, it would lead to fragmentation of both the whole curriculum and the part-curriculum, and treat issues in isolation from one another. In seeking to avoid fragmentation, development of an independent course in curriculum studies is also rejected since it is viewed as likely to either degenerate to superficiality or elevate to meaningless theoretical considerations.

On the other hand, they support developing an integrative focus through a multidisciplinary approach in which team teaching would be an important component. Three benefits of this approach are identified, and each is discussed as stated by the authors in relation to preservice teacher education.

> "Firstly it could serve a question-raising function. This could be especially valuable near the beginning of a course, perhaps immediately after a period of observation or teaching practice. It can certainly fulfil this role in inservice education, and we believe that with careful handling it could also do so in preservice education. The purpose would be to identify assumptions about subject matter, contingencies and goals, which

...57

> would subsequently be discussed in main subject and education courses. It could provide a practical base on which some of these courses could be built, thus adding a new dimension of relevance and commitment to more theoretical aspects of a student's work.
>
> In an exactly complementary fashion curriculum analysis could serve a unifying function towards the end of a course. If the earlier courses had dealt with the main forms of analysis, it could then concentrate on integrating the previous work and relating it to practical decision-making. To be successful, much more coordination of the curriculum would be needed than is commonly found at present; and it might need to be built into the assessment pattern if it was to be taken seriously at a late stage in the course. This could cause problems because we have found it an advantage to treat curriculum analysis as a small-group activity, and to use the resultant analyses as a basis for inter-group discussions.
>
> In both these roles curriculum analysis has been an integrative focus in an essentially multidisciplinary approach to curriculum study; whereas in its third, and possibly most attractive, role it is a longer interdisciplinary course which, by use of team teaching, combines all the separate analytical approaches discussed above. This would certainly avoid superficiality, but would not necessarily avoid metatheory. The remedy in our view is to concentrate on curriculum criticism and to include its aesthetic as well as its functional aspects" (Eraut *et al.*, 26-27).

Eraut *et al.* have transferred many of the assumptions underlying curriculum analysis for preservice teacher education to the inservice teacher education program offered at Sussex University. Curriculum analysis was applied initially to both short, one-week courses, and to post-graduate award courses as a means of preparing for topics in curriculum development where it was found useful in bridging its analytic and creative aspects. They state that:

> "One pattern we have evolved has much in common with some of our suggestions for pre-service education. We begin with a one week workshop in which groups of students analyse materials specifically chosen for their significance and issue-raising potential ..... This is followed by a series of interdisciplinary seminars during the term and concludes with each student producing an individual analysis for assessment .....

...58

> Now, however, we are experimenting with a new pattern in which an initial two-week workshop on the analysis of materials leads to an exploration of a part-curriculum in action. One seminar concentrates on curriculum issues in general while another seeks to provide methodological support for a brief empirical study. Two weeks are set aside for fieldwork, and the final analysis for assessment is expected to include both documentary and empirical evidence. There will be no attempt to engage in any formal measurement, and the empirical work will concentrate on observation and interviews. The purpose is to avoid an undue concentration on curriculum materials, to acquire a feel for non-quantitative empirical work and to encounter some of the problems of continuing documentary with empirical evidence" (Eraut *et al.*, 28).

The authors establish the following goals for content analysis in inservice teacher education: to improve the implementation of new curriculum materials to improve existing curricula; to guide the selection of curriculum materials, as a preliminary to curriculum development; and the encouragement and facilitation of self-evaluation. Additionally, Eraut *et al.* indicate specific objectives for the one week residential workshops. Minimum objectives would include developing a greater understanding of some curriculum materials being used in participants' schools; the ability to complete an analysis; and the ability to understand and use the Sussex Scheme. Beyond these minimal objectives, the authors intend that participants acquire a positive attitude toward curriculum analysis; increase their understanding of curriculum problems; develop their self-evaluative skills, and form relationships with other participants likely to be of value.

These workshops of teachers, advisers and lecturers were recruited through professional networks and selective invitations so that 20 to 30 people, later subdivided into 4 to 7 groups of 6 to 2 participants each, formed each class. An important characteristic of participants in these

...59

classes was the range of subject expertise, and different groups within each class analysed different curriculum materials.

Considerable preliminary activities on the part of workshop organisers and participants occurred. Participants were circulated with a short paper, 'Aims for Curriculum Analysis Workshops', The Introduction and Guide to the Sussex Scheme, The Sussex Scheme, a sample analysis, a timetable for the workshop, and a list of participants. Participants were also advised to familiarise themselves with the curriculum materials they intended to analyse.

The authors believed that the workshop timetable should be flexible although it should include three plenary sessions: an introductory session when attention is given to the aims of curriculum analysis; a final-day session for groups to report their activities; and an evaluation session in which the instrument and the teacher education program are discussed. The methodology adopted during the one-week workshops was directed to the Sussex Scheme providing the essential structure for the course. The role of the course leader was confined to that of a facilitator concentrating upon the development of understanding of the Sussex Scheme, the dynamics of group interactions and production of analyses.

The authors' analysis of the outcomes of the one-week workshops suggested that all objectives of the course were satisfied although there was some disappointment with the development of the analyses of curriculum materials. However, a major improvement occurred within the process objectives.

3.4 Other Sources

As reported, projects intended to improve the selection and the evaluation

...60

of curriculum materials through teacher education are not numerous. Documents, identified during the course of the ERIC search of the *Resources in Education* database are listed in part 2 of Appendix 2. A critique of each of those documents, judged to be instructional modules, will be provided in the following section of this chapter. In this section, the documents have been classified as either relating to a general treatment of the topic or relating to bilingual-bicultural education, multicultural education and related areas.

The remaining documents listed in part 2 of Appendix 2 were excluded because they were judged not to be instructional modules. These documents have also been classified as either one of the two types of research, and abstracts of each are included in the introductions to these subsections.

3.4.1 General Treatment

Wentling and Piland (1982), ED 225 025, have developed a non-classroom guide to assist the person, probably a librarian or a media specialist, to lead personnel of a local education agency in evaluating both print and audio-visual materials. The activity is presented in three parts: firstly, the conduct of an inventory of instructional materials owned by the local education agency; secondly, an assessment of the adequacy of the materials; and thirdly, the use of results from both the inventory and the assessment. The guide is divided into three sections. The first section describes the steps, including a staff meeting, necessary to prepare for the activity. The second section outlines suggested tasks for conducting the activity. The third section contains supporting documents to the guide.

...61

3.4:1.1 Special Education ~~Supervisor Training Project~~, The University of Texas at Austin

De Luca (1975), ED 120 986, is one of a series of ten self-study teacher training modules, each dealing with critical skills for supervisory teachers in schools. The materials were developed for local professional development programs to supplement formal training and field experiences.

The purpose of the module about materials selection is to provide supervisors with skills to develop a set of criteria for evaluating instructional materials and for conducting selection committee sessions. Participants are required to engage in an assignment divided into two parts and to evaluate their performance through a self-evaluation checklist and a post-test. Students can also optionally administer the post-test as a pre-test to measure their level of competence. Those students who successfully answer fewer than 75% of the items should continue the course.

Participants commence the course by reading the sections, Description of the Situation and Task Assignment, then Contents of a Selection Tool and scanning the section, Sources of Media Information (Selection Tools). They must also read the sections, Development of a Selection Procedure, and Controversial Areas in Library Materials before commencing the task assignment.

The task assignment includes a description of a role-playing situation and the assignment is divided into two parts. Firstly, students must develop a material's selection policy which includes a method for assessing cost based upon the potential usage, timeliness and durability of materials, a review of current materials, develop the use of field-tests, and ways of handling controversial issues. Secondly, they must develop a procedure for selecting instructional materials including developing and applying a selection instrument; they must receive and act upon suggestions for materials' acquistion; they must be able to judge the intervals at which selection should occur; they must devise the means for conducting materials' selection, including the membership of selection committees and devising procedures to be used in receiving gifts and donations to a library.

Once the task assignment has been undertaken, the student should complete the self-evaluation checklist followed by the post-test. Students failing to answer 75% of the items correctly should reread the module.

3.4.1.2 The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University

The Center for Vocational Education (1977), ED 149 063, is the fifth of six modules about instructional planning within a series of 100 performance-based teacher education modules. Materials within this series are designed for either self-study or group instruction within a professional development program under the direction of teacher educators acting as resource persons.

The module consists of three learning experiences. In the Overview to Learning Experience I, the developer provides statements about an enabling objective, five activities, two of which are optional, and feedback. The enabling objective states that students are to demonstrate knowledge about important considerations involved in selecting instructional materials. Students commence the learning activity by completing five activities. The first activity involves reading an extract from a reference book. The second activity involves reading an information sheet, then selecting and obtaining instructional materials. The third activity, which is optional, requires students to apply the Flesch readability formula to a sample text. The fourth activity, which is also optional, involves

...63

identifying current instructional materials, that are used locally, by contacting appropriate resource personnel. The fifth activity requires students to demonstrate their knowledge of important considerations involved in selecting and obtaining instructional materials by completing a checklist called a Self-check. The feedback requires students to compare their completed self-check against model answers.

In the Overview to Learning Experience II, the developer provides statements about an enabling objective, two activities and feedback. The enabling objective states that the student is to critique the performance of the teacher described in the Case Study. The feedback requires the students to evaluate their competencies by critiquing the teacher's performance in selecting and obtaining instructional materials. This is accomplished by the students comparing their completed critiques against the Model Critique provided in the module.

In the Overview to Learning Experience III, the developer provides statements about a terminal objective, an activity and feedback. The terminal objective requires the participant to select instructional materials whilst working in an actual school situation. The activity requires that the participant select instructional materials for a single lesson. The participant should take into account all factors governing the selection of instructional materials, search available sources, evaluate potential materials, list selections, and obtain selected materials. Feedback involves the resource person, such as the librarian, assessing the participant's performance in the activity by using the Teacher Performance Assessment Form.

3.4.1.3 Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois and Region I Adult Education Service Center, Chicago, Illinois

The series of modules developed by Charuhas (1984), ED 256 913, consists of an introduction, twelve modules and three appendices aimed at helping teachers and administrators select and evaluate curriculum materials that are appropriate to their educational programs. The series of modules is designed for either self-study or use within a teacher education program.

In the Introduction, the author provides the rationale for developing this series of modules and presents a model illustrating three key issues affecting the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials. This discussion is imbedded within an introductory statement about the modules.

Most of the modules are divided into four major sections: a statement about the objective of the module; a set of one or more activities; suggestions for the reader; and a list of references.

The first four modules are concerned with antecedent conditions that affect the teaching-learning process. The objective of Module 1, titled The Adult as Learner, is for participants to be able to identify forces --- the differing backgrounds of adult learners in their classes and their students' purposes for participating in further study --- affecting adult learners. There are three activities included in this module: in the first activity, participants can either develop a student information sheet or an exercise to elicit background information from students; in the second activity, participants are to plot a chart to

...65

indicate the composition of the class; and the third activity, participants are to prepare a summary of the information compiled in the chart. The objective of Module 2, Teaching Styles, is to enable participants to assess their own teaching style in terms of whether it is sufficiently flexible to cater for both materials designed for teacher-directed instruction and materials designed for individualised instruction. The module contains two activities: firstly, a survey to evaluate teaching styles; and secondly, provision for students to summarise the characteristics of their teaching style from information provided by the survey. The objective of Module 3, Teacher Strengths, is to present participants with the means to assess their own areas of expertise. Participants undertake two activities --- summarising their own self-assessments, and listing methods to overcome their own weaknesses --- following completion of a self-assessment inventory. The objective of Module 4, Learning Styles, is to enable participants to identify the components of learning style and relate them to classroom management. The module contains two activities: firstly, a questionnaire designed to determine participants own learning styles; and secondly, provision for participants to summarise characteristics of their own learning style.

Module 5 through to Module 9 focus upon major features of the evaluation of curriculum materials. Module 5, Textbook Organization, has the objective of enabling participants to identify major features of textbook organisation. In the only activity, participants are required to rank, in order of importance, such textbook organisers as the table of contents, the chapter headings, the lesson headings, pre-tests, post-tests, unit tests, the objectives, the index, the glossary, answer keys and progress chart for one subject area. The objective of Module 6, Orientation of Material, is to enable participants to determine if curriculum materials are skill-oriented or content-oriented. In the activity, participants must select

...66

materials that are either content-oriented or skill-oriented and determine how the characteristics of class activities, instructional exercises and question types of the type of material chosen differ from the other type. Module 7, Diagnosis, Reinforcement, Evaluation and Assessment, has the objective of enabling participants to identify the roles that diagnosis (pre-tests), reinforcement (practice exercises), evaluation (post-test or unit-test) and assessment (feedback to students in the form of scores and reports), play in a text. This module contains two activities: firstly, participants are required to identify examples of each type of material; and secondly, in designing a textbook, participants are required to determine and allocate portions of the text they are designing to emphases upon instructional design, diagnosis and orientation. Module 8, Adult Tone, has the objective of enabling participants to identify the factors involved in determining the audience for curriculum materials and biases that they may contain. This module contains two activities: participants are required, firstly, to evaluate four brief passages for bias; and secondly, to evaluate the 'tone' of a set of diagrams. The objective of Module 9, Format and Appearance, is to present participants with the means to identify and evaluate the format and appearance of curriculum materials. In the first of two activities, participants are required to determine the technical appropriateness of three materials they use. In the second activity, students are required to evaluate a set of layouts.

Module 10 examines the use of readability formulas in order to match the level of difficulty for reading of curriculum materials to students' reading abilities. The Dale-Chall, Spache and Fry formulas, Gunning-Fox index and cloze method are considered. This module contains two activities: firstly, participants complete a cloze exercise; and secondly, they measure

...67

the readability level of the same passage using both the Fry and Gunning-Fog formulas.

The remaining two modules are concerned with fitting curriculum materials to particular aspects of educational programs. The objective of Module 11, Supplemental Lessons, is to enable participants to plan their own supplemental lessons. The activity in this module requires the participants to develop a lesson plan. Module 12, Program Constraints, has the objective of enabling participants to identify the constraints upon educational programs --- class schedule, budgetting, purpose, and community resources --- which affect the selection of curriculum materials. This module contains two activities: firstly, students must apply a set of criteria to develop a profile of an educational program; and secondly, they must select materials for an educational program, taking into account the constraints identified.

Three appendices are attached to this document: a simulation game; a suggested outline for a materials evaluation workshop; and a materials evaluation checklist. The second appendix is considered here because of its relevance. The plan adopted for the materials evaluation workshop incorporates content extracted from each of the modules within the main section of the document. A final section within this appendix recommends applying 'hands-on' evaluation of curriculum materials through small groups, developing criteria for evaluating materials through consensus, and evaluating the training sequences through discussion and writing.

3.4.2 Bilingual-bicultural Education, Multicultural Education and Related Areas

...68

Banks (1974), ED 090 307, reports an experimental research design to test whether teachers who had been trained to evaluate curriculum materials for possible racial bias, would have become more aware of the need to evaluate textbooks for bias and would be able to perform the evaluations more effectively within their school districts. Teachers of the first through third grades were trained by means of *Content Analysis of Textbooks for Black Students*, Grades 1-3, a self-instructional program developed by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Rabin (1978), ED 172 163, reports an experimental design, of an action research type, to compare two approaches to inservice programming in staff development: an inservice workshop using independent materials; and the same workshop using materials followed by individualised assistance. The problem addressed concerned the selection and use of appropriate reading materials by content area teachers. The results of the study showed that those teachers who received individualised assistance felt more competent although there was little change in behaviour between teachers in the two groups.

3.4.2.1 Teacher Corps Bilingual Project, University of Hartford, Hartford, Connecticutt

The module developed by Hernandez and Melnick (n.d.), ED 095 141, consists of a pre-test, two learning activities and a post-test. It is designed for providing participants in a teacher corps bilingual project at the University of Hartford with guidelines for evaluating and adapting written materials for English-as-a-second-language classes. The module is designed for classroom use.

The objective of the learning unit is to evaluate any written material for relevance, content and achievement of the teaching aims. The pre-test, termed pre-assessment, is designed to measure mastery of the objective by requiring participants to prepare an evaluation of a material based upon specific criteria about the relevance, the content and the achievement of teaching aims.

The first learning activity requires the participants to choose one of four learning alternatives. Each of the learning alternatives requires the participants to evaluate part of a textbook. The first two alternatives require the participants to read extracts from texts current at the time of the module's publication; the third alternative requires the participants to evaluate one of four types of textbooks in terms of its promotion of the achievement of teaching aims by applying an appropriate set of criteria; and the fourth alternative requires the participants to prepare an evaluation of a material based upon an interview with a teacher.

The second learning activity requires the participants to select one of five learning activities. Again, the first three alternatives are reading activities followed by evaluation activities applying techniques derived from the readings; whilst the fourth alternative requires the participants to design their own learning activities; and the fifth alternative requires participants to attend a scheduled seminar.

The contents of the post-test are identical to the pre-test. Competency is assessed by the module coordinator, and participants requiring remediation, contract to undertake alternative learning activities with their coordinator.

...70

3.4.2.2 Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, California

The module designed by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (1977), ED 177 048, consists of three lessons intended to enable teachers to select literature with a multicultural perspective. The module is designed for either self-instruction or class use.

Statements of objectives introduce the preliminary lesson. The objectives state that the participants should understand the importance of judging books for their inclusion of minority cultural experiences; that the participants should be sensitive to the importance of including, in classroom materials, portrayals of people that are relevant to their experiences and cultures; and that the participants should develop the skills of analysing the illustrations and written content of children's books in terms of the perspective of a particular culture.

In Lesson One, titled Illustrations reflecting People of a Particular Culture, the participants read the lesson in the module. This includes a passage followed by a set of criteria used to identify biassed stereotyping in books. Knowledge of these criteria is then applied by the participants to two exercises: in the first, Analysing Illustrations, the participants are expected to analyse a book for inclusion of representative characterisations of people of a particular culture; in the second, Diversity in Book Illustrations, an individual or group exercise, participants select books that illustrate differences between the experiences of people of a particular culture and are free of stereotypes. This is followed by a brief Follow-up Discussion relating to the second exercise.

...71

In Lesson Two, titled The Multicultural Experience: A Unique Reality, participants participate as a group in eight experiences designed to provide information for analysing the written content of children's books illustrating a black perspective. In the first experience, What do You See --- and Why?, participants view a pair of facial images in the module, respond to these images and compare their perspectives of the images. In the third experience, Using Cultural Categories to Classify Examples of Similarities and Differences of Personal Experiences, participants complete a cultural matrix. In the fourth experience, Ethnic Group Realities, the participants examine and comment about a cartoon featured at the commencement of the lesson. In the fifth experience, discovering the Black Perspective, the participants read an article, 'Black Perspective in Children's Books', appended to the module and then take part in a group discussion to clarify the contents of the article. In the sixth experience, Analysing the Written Content of Children's Books using a Black Perspective, the participants complete two assignments: firstly, the written content analysis instrument, level 1; and secondly, a book entry sheet. In the seventh experience, Evaluation Guide, the participants check their application of the written content analysis instrument in the first assignment. In the eighth experience, On Your Own, the participants apply the written content analysis instrument to evaluate a multicultural textbook.

Two appendices are attached to the module: the first is titled, Black Perspective in Books for Children; and the second is titled, Developer's Analysis of 'Evan's Corner'. 'Evan's Corner' is a literary extract analysed by the participants during the course of their study of the module.

3.4.2.3 Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio

...72

Eberhardt and Lloyd (1975), ED 106 753, is the first of a series of nine modules, or individualised inservice packets, about reading procedures that can be implemented in all subjects in the elementary, middle and secondary levels of schooling. Each of the modules is designed for self-instructional use.

The module, *Assessment of Print Materials*, consists of five sections: Assessment of Student Reading Competency; Readability Level of Print Materials; Assessment of Problems within the Selected Content; Adaptation of Content; and Evaluation of Basic Text. An Introduction contains a statement of the three-fold goal of the module. Each section, designed in a similar format, contains a statement of the section's objective, a content abstract, and an application of the participant's performance through a set of exercises. A self-corrective post-test constitutes a final section to the module.

The three-fold goal, presented in the Introduction, directs the participant, firstly, to assess student reading competency; secondly, to determine the readability level of a material; and thirdly, to adapt materials, enabling students to master the vocabulary and concepts.

The objective of the first section is to enable the participant to assess the reading competence and interests of individual students. The Content Abstract informs the participant about two techniques for assessing students' reading competencies: by using norm-referenced achievement tests to measure a group's performance; and by applying diagnostic techniques to measure the performance of underachieving students. The Content Abstract also contains suggested ways to sample students' reading interests: questionnaires; observations; interest surveys; and identification instruments. The exercises presented in the Application relate to performing each of these skills.

...73

The objective of the second section is to enable the participant to determine the readability levels of print materials. The Content Abstract describes how the Fry Readability Formula can be applied to analysing readability levels of print materials. The Application requires the participant to use the Fry Readability Formula to analyse three passages.

The objective of the third section is to enable the participant to analyse readability factors which will affect reading difficulty. The Content Abstract informs the participant about how to identify these particular types of factors --- vocabulary, and levels of abstraction. The Application requires the participant to analyse components that make a sample passage easy or difficult to understand.

The objective of the fourth section is to enable the participant to adapt content of reading material so that it is appropriate to the waried levels of students' reading abilities. The Content Abstract contains a set of guidelines for assessing whether reading materials require adaptation. The Application requires the participant to adapt a written passage so as to render it both simpler and more challenging.

The objective of the fifth section is to enable the participant to apply a standardised instrument to evaluate a print material. Such an evaluation is then to be used as a basis for selecting materials by applying two criteria: that the content of the material must relate to the particular area of the curriculum; and that the material must be suitable to the reading achievement levels of the particular students. Criteria for evaluating four types of print materials are listed in the Content Abstract: total series; student materials; teacher's edition; and supplementary materials. The Application requires the participant to use the Evaluation

...74

Guideline to assess a textbook, teacher's manual and a supplementary material.

The Self-corrective Post Test requires the participant to apply aspects of what have been learnt. By selecting a random sample of ten students from a class the participant teaches, he or she plots their reading expectancy levels against reading achievement test scores. These scores are then used to identify the students' frustration, instructional and independent reading levels.

3.5 Conclusion

The examination of the sources for materials to train teachers to select and evaluate curriculum materials indicates that these developments have not been extensive. The outcome of this examination, to the extent that it relates to bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education, is presented in this chapter.

Teacher education has played a significant function in each of the three institutions examined. The Social Science Education Consortium has applied its *Curriculum Materials Analysis System* to teacher training. The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute has developed several sets of teacher education materials in an endeavour to train teachers to conduct evaluations of educational materials specifically for EPIE Reports and, more generally, to educate teachers to become more competent in their selections of curriculum materials for classroom use. The project fostered by the Centre for Educational Technology, University of Sussex, has made a valuable contribution to theoretical implications for teacher education on the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials.

...75

The literature in this field, presented in Chapter 2, showed that the trend in the analysis of curriculum materials has been concentrated in three main spheres: the application of instruments that provide, to a greater or lesser extent, the capabilities for descriptive analysis, evaluation and decision-making functions; the application of objective measures to evaluate bias; and the application of measures to match the readability levels of curriculum materials to students' reading levels. This situation has been substantiated by the review of institutional activities presented in Chapter 3.

Developments in teacher education to improve the quality of selecting and evaluating curriculum materials, however, have not maintained pace with the spheres identified above. The examination of developments in teacher education, from both the selected institutions and from other sources, has shown that most attention has been given to providing training in the use of instruments that evaluate curriculum materials. More recently, some attention has been given to providing teacher education to match readability levels of curriculum materials to students' reading levels. This attention, however, is still rudimentary; the investigation of these techniques to match bilingual-bicultural materials to students' reading levels in their second language, together with consequent aspects of teacher education, warrants research. On the other hand, there has been little attention given to training teachers in techniques to recognise and evaluate biases in curriculum materials.

...76

4. THE PROPOSAL FOR A TEACHER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

4.1 Introduction

Two fundamental and contrasting views of curriculum development are indicated in the literature: the objectives model; and approaches that are opposed to the objectives model (Stenhouse, 1975; Lawton *et al.*, 1978; Brady, 1983). To clarify discussion about the planning of this teacher development program, each of these views is briefly discussed below.

The objectives model has been of foremost importance to curriculum development since Tyler (1949) provided its first systematic account. The objectives model presumes four broad principles: stating objectives; selecting learning experiences; organising learning experiences; and evaluation. The initial stage, stating objectives, from which the process of systematic curriculum development occurs, received detailed attention in a taxonomy of objectives for the cognitive domain (Bloom *et al.*, 1956), and a taxonomy of objectives for the affective domain (Krathwohl *et al.*, 1964). In contrast to this refinement of objectives, Taba (1962) provided the principal statement relating these principles to the practice of curriculum development. Taba enunciated eight sequential steps: diagnosing needs; formulating objectives; selecting content; organising content; selecting learning experiences; organising learning experiences; evaluating; and checking for balance and sequence.

Whereas, the specification of objectives is emphasised in the objectives model, the sequential ordering of steps in curriculum planning is not recognised in the other approaches. Two main approaches might be said to support this principle: the process model; and the interaction model.

...77

Advocates of the process model stress that there should be no initial statement about objectives; greater emphasis should be placed upon methodology than content; both content and methodology are intrinsically valuable; and that evaluation should serve as a means of establishing the worth of outcomes rather than measuring prespecified objectives. Peters (1966), first suggested the foundations for the process model, by insisting that areas of knowledge in curriculum activities are intrinsic parts of the curriculum rather than means to ends as they are treated in the objectives model. Stenhouse stressed that the process model is more appropriate to curricular areas which centre on knowledge and understanding whilst, at the same time, insisting that the objectives model is more appropriate to areas which emphasise information and skills.

In the process model, it is presumed that a series of significant questions about a course must be discerned and answered as it progresses. Stenhouse has provided principles upon which such questions should be established: four principles of planning which comprise selection of content, development of a teaching strategy, decisions about sequence, and diagnosis of student strengths and weaknesses, including applying the three preceding principles to individual cases; four principles of empirical study which comprise study of student progress, study of teacher progress, establishing the feasibility of implementing the curriculum in different school contexts, pupil contexts, environments and peer group situations, and providing information and explanation about the variability of effects in differing contexts and on different students; and one principle related to justification, the formulation of the intention or aim of the curriculum which is open to scrutiny.

Unlike the objectives model, the interaction model does not presuppose a sequence between the different elements of the curriculum.
Brady (1983) contrasts the interaction model with the objectives model. Whereas the sequential ordering of the elements of the curriculum are presumed

...78

within the objectives model, the curriculum is viewed in the interaction model as a dynamic process between the elements, in which no element predominates. It is assumed, however, that changes to one curriculum element will affect the other elements. Curriculum development can commence with any one of the four curriculum elements, and curriculum developers are not restricted in when and how they develop or modify the elements.

In conclusion, it should now be evident that each of these models for curriculum development has both strengths and weaknesses. The strengths of the objectives model are generally the weaknesses of the alternative approaches and weaknesses of the objectives model are generally the strengths of the alternative approaches. In accepting Stenhouse's pronouncement that the respective emphases placed upon either knowledge and understanding or information and skills should constitute the criterion for selecting and adopting a particular model of curriculum development, the author has selected and adopted the objectives model. The emphasis of this teacher education program is placed upon the development of skills, and imparting knowledge is subordinate. Despite this decision, account will be taken of the strengths of the alternative approaches in developing the constructs of the program.

As the foremost exposition of the objectives model in terms of the practice of curriculum development, Taba's eight steps will be adhered to in developing the teacher education program. Pratt (1980) has refined these steps within the wider scope of curriculum development and implementation, and these refinements will be incorporated within the ensuing discussion.

...79

4.2 Preliminary Steps

4.2.1 Needs Assessment

Taba's first step, which Pratt describes as a preliminary step to curriculum development, is needs assessment. Needs assessment refers to a set of procedures to identify and validate needs, establish priorities among them and promote effective public relations. Needs assessments originated during the mid-1960's in the United States of America, when federal education authorities required state education departments and school districts to undertake comprehensive assessments to justify fundings.

The policies and practices for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials have been inadequately addressed through needs assessments. A survey of the documents entered into the databases of the Educational Resources Information Center, and listed in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3, indicates that four documents annotated in the *Resources in Education* database, and one article annotated in the *Current Index to Journals in Education* database, have discussed needs assessment. The authors of these documents are the Institute of Educational Development (1969), ED 044 030, Kamhi (1982), ED 208 885 and ED 210 772, and the California State Department of Education (1984), ED 256 748, annotated in in the *Resources in Education* database, and Talmage (1981), EJ 241 804, annotated in the *Current Index to Journals in Education* database. No documents that apply needs assessment to selecting and evaluating curriculum materials were located in either the *Australian Education Index* or the *British Education Index.*

The author conducted a survey of opinions held by twelve coordinators of courses conducted by the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers in order to identify the need for teacher education to improve the quality of

...80

the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials. These courses were chosen because they contained subject matter that related directly to selecting and evaluating curriculum materials, or included subject matter related to bilingual-bicultural education or multicultural education. The subjects were Computers in Education, Early Childhood Education, Educational Media, Language Development and Multicultural Education, Literature for Children, and School and Classroom-based Curriculum Development.

The survey was intended to identify three characteristics about the attitudes of course coordinators to teacher education for improving the quality of the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials. The following terms were given to the three characteristics on the questionnaire: knowledge and skills (which were intended to identify the need for teachers to possess the knowledge and the skills to select and evaluate curriculum materials); choice of course design (which was intended to identify the most appropriate way to provide such knowledge and skills within the program offered by the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers); and the form that curriculum development should take in the program of the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers to successfully meet the needs of teachers. An analysis of the results of the survey is presented in Appendix 8.

A statistical analysis of this data was not attempted because only six subjects responded to the survey. Opinions expressed by the respondents, however, indicated that:

1. they agreed that teachers required the knowledge and the skills to select curriclum materials;
2. they agreed that a subject-oriented course design was the most appropriate way to present such knowledge and skills;
3. they were generally uncertain about, or felt the course content presented in Appendix 7 did not match their expectations of teachers' requirements;

...81

4. they were uncertain about supporting the development of a general program to treat the knowledge, the skills, the attitudes and the values involved in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials; and
5. in all cases, they stated that they included subject matter in their courses that related to the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials.

This survey was not intended to fulfil, nor did it accomplish, the requirements of a needs assessment. The survey was only intended to provide an indication about attitudes of coordinators towards introducing different types of teacher education programs for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials. It was only partly successful in satisfying this intention, as no attempt was made to survey the course coordinators about the range of options discussed in Chapter 5.

4.2.2 Antecedent Conditions

Pratt insists that curriculum developers should pay heed to a number of issues which are sometimes termed in the literature, 'front-end analysis'. Essentially, front-end analysis involves a process of analysing antecedent conditions and making crucial decisions about a proposal for curriculum development on the basis of such analyses.

Pratt specifies a series of analyses of antecedent conditions: assessing students' performances about the particular content area to judge whether an identified need is being currently met; considering alternatives to curriculum development; considering curriculum parameters --- institutional context, target population, time and cost, resources, and identifying constraints (those relating to learners, political considerations, educational policies and internal institutional factors).

...82

No instances were identified in the literature search where antecedent conditions, for developing and implementing a teacher education program to improve the quality of the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials, were analysed. Furthermore, few resources were identified upon which analyses of antecedent conditions could draw. The search of the databases of the Educational Resources Information Center identified a single instrument, that developed by Willis (1976), ED 125 654, to assess students.

A second major set of issues at this stage of curriculum development involves establishing a suitable curriculum development team and scheduling the project. It is apparent that for the six documents identified in the *Resources in Education* database, curriculum development teams were formed in four cases (De Luca, The Center for Vocational Education, Charuhas, and the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development). Although, in each case, staff of the respective institutions formed the bases of the curriculum development teams, the scope and degree of involvement of other personnel varied considerably. Only in the case of the development of the series of modules for teacher education at The Ohio State University, were personnel, numbering several thousand, involved from other tertiary institutions and schools.

4.3 The Constructs of the Curriculum

4.3.1 Formulating Objectives

Taba believed that the needs assessment applied to a curriculum issue will help to direct the developer to those objectives that need to be emphasised. Furthermore, the analysis of the antecedent conditions will also assist the developer's specification of objectives. Taba stated that these objectives

...83

should encompass statements about concepts or ideas to be learned; attitudes and values to be developed; ways of thinking to be reinforced, strengthened or initiated; and habits and skills to be mastered.

The purpose of this teacher education program is to provide bilingual-bicultural and multicultural educators with the knowledge and skills necessary to select, to adopt and to analyse curriculum materials that are appropriate to the needs of particular ethnic and linguistic groups. The goal of this program is to provide the knowledge and skills that are essential for this purpose: an understanding about the critical problems associated with bilingual-bicultural and multicultural curriculum materials and the skills to analyse these problems; an understanding of producers' responsiblities to validate their products and the skills to evaluate the extent of producers' validation activities; an understanding of the types of personnel and techniques to be used to select, adopt and utilise curriculum materials and the skills to assist in participating in selection, adoption and utilisation procedures; and an understanding of the application of Tyler's objectives model to the analysis of curriculum materials and the skills necessary to conduct analyses of curriculum materials.

This program has been developed as a component of a broader, multidisciplinary teacher education program that has the aim of providing knowledge and skills for teachers and other professional educators to select, adopt and analyse curriculum materials. The goal of the program is encompassed in four topics, the first of which is directed to a group of bilingual-bicultural and multicultural educators in a workshop, whilst the remaining topics are directed to the class group in a workshop. The order of the topics presented in the program is not intended to determine the sequence of their presentation in a workshop. The topics, which are intended to be presented through introductory

...84

discussion and demonstration followed by student performance through analysis, generalisation and application, address: firstly, the characteristics of bilingual-bicultural and multicultural curriculum materials; secondly, the assessment of producers' validation activities; thirdly, the selection, the adoption and the utilisation of curriculum materials; and finally, the evaluation of curriculum materials.

The objectives of each topic are:

1. to understand and learn the explicit concepts, defined in each topic, that are necessary to perform tasks associated with the processes of analysis, generalisation and application;
2. to apply these concepts to the analysis of curriculum materials;
3. to apply these concepts to generalise conclusions through comparative analysis of curriculum materials in different situations; and
4. to apply these concepts to the analysis of curriculum materials within the educational context of a workplace.

4.3.2 Selecting Content

In selecting content, Taba specified three subordinate steps: selecting topics; selecting basic ideas; and selecting specific content. Taba also specified criteria for determining the structure of each of the subordinate steps: the significance and validity of the content; learnability and appropriateness to learners' needs and developmental levels.

In fulfilling the requirements of Taba's subordinate steps, the contents of this teacher education program were selected to meet the specified educational objectives on the basis of two criteria. Firstly, the contents of the teacher education materials described in Chapter 3 were examined. Through reaching a decision about what the developers of these materials viewed to be the critically important knowledge, skills, attitudes and values to be imparted, the author selected and included such features within this teacher education program. Secondly, what the author considered to be significant knowledge, skills, attitudes and values also guided the selection and inclusion of such content within the teacher education program.

The topics addressed in each of the teacher education modules are now described briefly. The contents of the modules developed by the Special Education Supervisor Training Project at The University of Texas at Austin (De Luca) and The Center for Vocational Education at The Ohio State University are directed to selecting curriculum materials, whilst the contents of the modules developed by the Teacher Corps Bilingual Project at the University of Hartford, Hartford, Connecticutt (Hernandez and Melnick), the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, The Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio (Eberhardt and Lloyd), and the Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois and the Region I Adult Education Service Center, Chicago, Illinois (Charuhas) are directed to evaluating curriculum materials. Since the quality of these documents varies considerably, a concluding statement within each description indicates which aspects of the contents are deemed to be valid for including in the course description of a teacher education program.

De Luca specifies that the trainees, the prospective selectors of curriculum materials, develop a policy and procedure for selecting curriculum materials. A topic that includes content on selection policy and procedures is an essential component of a valid teacher education program.

The document by The Center for Vocational Education specifies that teachers should achieve three objectives: firstly, demonstrate knowledge of the

...86

important considerations involved in selecting curriculum materials; secondly, critique the performance of a teacher, described in that section of the module, in selecting curriculum materials; and thirdly, conduct a selection of instructional materials in an actual school situation. Each of these topics includes a valid skill for students to master within a teacher education program.

In their instructional module developed for use in The Teacher Corps Bilingual Project, Hernandez and Melnick require students to be able to evaluate the content of curriculum materials. It is evident that this document was only developed for local use. Because the constructs of this material are poorly matched, application of its contents are not recommended for inclusion in a teacher education program.

The document by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development specifies that the trainees, multicultural educators, evaluate both illustrations and prose passages of curriculum materials for multicultural education for bias. Because the development of these skills are particularly important for improving the quality of bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education, they are included within the contents of the teacher education program.

The objectives of four of the five sections of Eberhardt and Lloyd relate to the assessment of reading competencies of students, readability analysis of curriculum materials, and the adaptation of curriculum materials to cater for students' needs. Only the last section is concerned with the evaluation of curriculum materials by means of an instrument. Despite the subject-related emphasis of this document to reading instruction, the authors recognise the need for the content of reading materials to match learners' reading levels. This feature, together with the need for participants to

...87

apply an instrument to the evaluation of curriculum materials, is an essential component of the contents of a valid teacher education program.

The objectives of the twelve modules developed by Charuhas relate to four main features for evaluating curriculum materials: establishing antecedent conditions; evaluating the physical characteristics of curriculum materials; evaluating the content (bias and readability levels) of curriculum materials; and matching textbooks to curriculum objectives. The considerations given in the initial and concluding chapters of Charuhas, which relate the processes of selecting and evaluating curriculum materials, in the first case, to teaching-learning methods and, in the second case, to curricular contexts in which the curriculum materials are to be implemented, are particularly significant features to be included in the contents of a teacher education program. Although the coverage of the topics about evaluating the contents of curriculum materials is not treated comprehensively in this document, content on both the evaluation of the contents and physical characteristics of curriculum materials must be included in a teacher education program.

The topics addressed by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (n.d.), are aimed at training the Institute's evaluators of curriculum materials and other educational products through an application of the technical facilities of the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute. The emphasis placed upon this aspect restricts the extent to which one can draw upon the contents of this module. Despite this, it is essential to include the basic ideas of this module within a valid teacher education program: the learning materials' continuum; Tyler's rationale; the 'bridge' analogy of instructional materials design and use; internal and external congruence; and an introduction to curriculum-content-evaluation correlation.

...88

It is proposed, therefore, that the contents for a teacher education program in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education should include the following contents selected from the documents for teacher education described in Chapter 3.

1. the development of a selection policy
2. the development of a procedure for selecting curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education
3. a critique of a teacher's performance in selecting bilingual-bicultural and multicultural curriculum materials
4. the conduct of a selection of curriculum materials in the context of the participant's workplace
5. the evaluation of bias in illustrations and prose passages in multicultural curriculum materials
6. the evaluation of the readability (or language level) of multicultural and second language materials and the matching of these readability (or language) levels to students' levels of reading and language use
7. the evaluation of the physical characteristics of curriculum materials
8. an understanding about matching curriculum materials and curriculum constructs
9. an understanding about the learning materials' continuum
10. an understanding of Tyler's objectives model for curriculum development
11. an understanding of the 'bridge' analogy
12. an understanding of the internal and external congruences of curriculum materials
13. an understanding of the curriculum-content-evaluation correlation

In the author's opinion, certain additional topics must be included in the content of such a teacher education program. The program would include the following topics.

1. the presentation of knowledge about alternative means for selecting curriculum materials (within a continuum extending from selection by individual selectors to selection by committee either inside or outside the educational context)

2. the presentation of alternative techniques for selecting curriculum materials (within a continuum extending from the use of undefined criteria and standards to appraisal forms applying commonly agreed-upon criteria and standards)

3. the presentation of alternative means for evaluating curriculum materials (within a continuum extending from individual evaluators, or individual evaluators and editors to an evaluation team operating inside or outside the educational context)

4. the presentation of alternative techniques for evaluating curriculum materials (within a continuum extending from literary reviews to evaluation instruments based upon explicitly defined or optional curriculum models

5. the presentation of knowledge about institutions and publications currently contributing to the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials

6. the presentation of knowledge about problems inherent in curriculum materials:

   - the characteristics of quality in curriculum materials including the lack of criteria to define such quality
   - the conduct of research in curriculum materials to provide needed answers showing the inadequacy of the experimental model of research to adequately investigate the problems of curriculum materials particularly those designed to impart values
   - the incorporation of forms of learner-based verification and revision showing their applicability to different types of learning materials, compilation of such data by valid and reliable trial-testing and field-testing procedures
   - the need to define responsibility for learning resulting from curriculum materials

...90

7. the presentation of knowledge and skills about the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education

4.3.3 Organising Content

Following selection of the content, Taba stated that its organisation should depend upon an order based upon a feasible learning sequence. Taba believed that the sequence may require combining ideas viewed independently in the previous step; sequencing ideas commencing from those that provide informative background for more complex ideas, and sequencing ideas on the basis of increasingly difficult mental operations. Taba proposed that a curriculum developer should apply these criteria collectively to determine the order of the content. The pattern for organising content should be based upon determining the topic, the basic ideas, the sample of content, and questions representing the dimensions of study.

The topics, listed in Section 4.3.2, have been ordered following the prerequisite steps recommended by Taba. The outline of this ordering is presented in Table 8. Table 8 shows that the contents of the teacher education program have been organised into four topics: firstly, the characteristics of bilingual-bicultural and multicultural curriculum materials; secondly, assessing producers' validation activities; thirdly, selecting, adopting and utilising curriculum materials; and fourthly, evaluating curriculum materials.

The predominant aim in sequencing the organisation of the contents of this teacher education program is to comply with the prerequisites identified by Eraut *et al.* In substance, these authors avoided either a subject-oriented approach or a separate course in curriculum studies by integrating both the

Table 8: The Organisation of the Content for the Teacher Education Program

Topics of Study	Dimensions of Study	Questions for Study
1. The characteristics of bilingual-bicultural and multicultural curriculum materials	1.1 linguistic content: criteria for judging linguistic content of the second language of bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials --- standard: uses second language material understood by most world-wide speakers --- dialect: uses second language material characteristic of a region --- culturally charged: uses words or phrases in the second language material characteristic of a particular ethnic group that have no equivalents in the language used by other ethnic groups, nor are they translatable --- unacceptable: uses second language material of unacceptable overall standards in linguistic content (morphology, syntax)	1.1.1 What is the standard form of a language, a dialect, culturally charged content, and unacceptable morphological and syntactic content? 1.1.2 How is the linguistic content of the second language of bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials evaluated?
	1.2 language level: criteria for judging the language level of the second language of bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials --- beginner: material designed for learners with no or limited experience in the second language --- intermediate: material designed for learners with some experience in the second language --- advanced: material designed for learners fluent in the second language	1.2.1 What is generally accepted to be the language level of a second language in bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials? 1.2.2 How is the language level of a second language in bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials evaluated
	1.3 bias in illustrations: criteria for judging bias in illustrations of bilingual-bicultural and multicultural curriculum materials --- living conditions: a variety of settings for living are shown that reflect the conditions of a minority group	1.3.1 What is bias in illustrations presented in curriculum materials? 1.3.2 How is bias in illustrations evaluated?

Topics for Study	Dimensions of Study	Questions for Study
	--- occupational roles: adults of a minority group are shown in a variety of occupational roles	
	--- characterisation: characters of a minority group should be expressive and demonstrate expressions compatible with their situations	
	--- physical features: minority characters should show varying complexions and other physical features	
	1.4 bias in the written content: a criterion for judging bias in the written content of bilingual-bicultural and multicultural curriculum materials	1.4.1 What is bias in the written content presented in curriculum materials? 1.4.2 How is bias in the written content evaluated in curriculum materials?
	--- evaluative coefficient analysis: provides a quantitative index of the treatment of minority groups	
2. How to assess producers' evaluation activities	2.1 assessing the characteristics of quality	2.1.1 What criteria can be used to determine quality in curriculum materials?
	2.2 research about curriculum materials	2.2.1 What research models are best for investigating different types of curriculum materials?
	2.3 product validation	
	2.3.1 preliminary verification and revision	
	2.3.1.1 inspection	2.3.1.1.1 At what stage in a curriculum material's development should inspection be conducted? 2.3.1.1.2 How is inspection of a curriculum material conducted? 2.3.1.1.3 Who should inspect a curriculum material? 2.3.1.1.4 What forms of revision to a curriculum material should occur after inspection?
	2.3.1.2 simulation	2.3.1.2.1 At what stage in a curriculum material's development should simulation be conducted? 2.3.1.2.2 How is simulation of a curriculum material conducted? 2.3.1.2.3 Who should conduct a simulation of a curriculum material? 2.3.1.2.4 What forms of revision to a curriculum material will occur after simulation?

Topics of Study	Dimensions of Study	Questions for Study
	2.3.2 learner-based verification and revision	
	2.3.2.1 pilot trial	2.3.2.1.1 At what stage in a curriculum material's development should pilot trialling be conducted? 2.3.2.1.2 How is pilot triallin of a curriculum material conducted? 2.3.2.1.3 Who should pilot trial a curriculum material? 2.3.2.1.4 What forms of revisio should occur to a curriculum material after pilot trialling?
	2.3.2.2 pilot test	2.3.2.2.1 At what stage in a curriculum material's developme should pilot testing be conducted? 2.3.2.2.2 How is pilot testing of a curriculum material conducted? 2.3.2.2.3 Who should pilot test a curriculum material? 2.3.2.2.4 What forms of revisio to a curriculum material should occur after pilot testing?
	2.3.2.3 field trial	2.3.2.3.1 At what stage in a curriculum material's development should field trialling be conducted? 2.3.2.3.2 How is field triallin of a curriculum material conducted? 2.3.2.3.3 Who should field tria a curriculum material? 2.3.2.3.4 What forms of revisio should occur to a curriculum material after trialling?
	2.3.2.4 field test	2.3.2.4.1 At what stage in a curriculum material's development should field testing be conducted? 2.3.2.4.2 How is field testing of a curriculum material conducted? 2.3.2.4.3 Who should field test a curriculum material? 2.3.2.4.4 What forms of revisio should occur to a curriculum material after field testing?
	2.4 the responsibility of the publisher for learning occurring from curriculum materials	2.4.1 What outcomes for learner does the publisher intend that the curriculum material achieve? 2.4.2 With which target population does the publisher intend the material to be used?

Topics of Study	Dimensions of Study	Questions for Study
		2.4.3 What techniques does the publisher use to gather feedback from learners about curriculum materials? 2.4.4 What descriptions does the publisher provide of procedures adopted for product validation? 2.4.5 To what extent does the publisher provide information about his analysis of findings from product validation? 2.4.6 What evidence does the publisher provide about specif improvements made to the curriculum material following product validation?
3. Selecting, adopting and utilising curriculum materials	3.1 the different techniques for selecting curriculum materials	3.1.1 How should the selection of curriculum materials occur?
	3.2 the different means of selecting curriculum materials	3.2.1 Who should select curriculum materials?
	3.3 the different techniques for adopting curriculum materials	3.3.1 How should the adoption of curriculum materials occur?
	3.4 the different means of adopting curriculum materials	3.4.1 Who should adopt curricu materials?
	3.5 the different techniques for utilising curriculum materials	3.5.1 How should the process f utilisation of curriculum materials occur?
	3.6 the different means of utilising curriculum materials	3.6.1 Who should be involved in the process for utilisation of curriculum materials?
4. Evaluating curriculum materials	4.1 the learning materials' continuum (EPIE Institute)	4.1.1 What is the learning material's continuum? 4.1.2 How does an understandin of the learning materials' continuum improve the evaluati of curriculum materials?
	4.2 Tyler's rationale of curriculum development	4.2.1 What is Tyler's rational of curriculum development? 4.2.2 How can the objectives model (Tyler's rationale) of curriculum development be applied to evaluating curriculum materials? 4.2.3 Are other models of curriculum development appropriate for evaluating curriculu materials?
	4.3 the 'bridge' analogy (EPIE Institute)	4.3.1 What does EPIE Institute 'bridge' analogy explain? 4.3.2 What are the implication of the 'bridge' analogy for evaluating curriculum materials?

generic-oriented and the subject-oriented contents within a multidisciplinary approach in which team teaching is an important component. The organisation of the contents of the teacher education program meets this prerequisite by initially focussing those participants with expertise in bilingual-bicultural education or multicultural education upon critical issues for the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials within their discipline. It can be surmised that participants with expertise in other content areas of the curriculum will, at this time, be engaged in an appropriate topic. For the three remaining topics, the focus is then directed to generic-oriented issues in selecting, adopting and evaluating curriculum materials. Although the organisation of the contents complies, in these ways, with the prerequisites stated by Eraut *et al.*, this particular organisation is not intended to determine the sequencing of the topics for the program. By allowing for flexibility in the sequencing of topics, those implementing the program can apply it to different contexts as well as meet the requirements of team-teaching roles and tasks. The issues involved in implementing this teacher education program in different contexts are discussed in Chapter 5.

4.3.4 Selecting and Organising Learning Experiences

Taba indicated that two fundamental criteria are encompassed in selecting learning experiences. Firstly, she stated that an initial criterion for selecting learning experiences is that the ideas in the topics should serve a function. It is apparent that such functions should relate to the purpose of the program, its aims and its specific objectives. In providing effective learning experiences, Taba saw the need to express the learning experiences in terms of what performances and behaviours students should master to attain particular competencies. Secondly, she believed that an order should be formulated among learning experiences.

Sequencing of learning experiences involves four main stages: activities for introduction, opener and orientation; activities for development, analysis and study; activities for generalisation; and activities for application, summary and culmination. Introductory activities are designed to fulfil five functions: to provide diagnostic evidence to the instructor; to assist the students relate the topic to their own experience; to arouse interest; to provide descriptive information about the main issues; and to motivate the student. Additionally, this stage may include planning with students, and occasionally preparing feelings and sensitivities of the students to main issues. The second stage provides learning activities involving reading, research, analysis of data, group work and study of various types. The third stage provides students with the scope to compare and contrast the significant ideas and formulate conclusions. The final stage provides the opportunity to assess and evaluate, or apply what has been learnt to a new situation. Taba does not offer precise statements about selecting teaching-learning methods. She is careful to express, however, the need to present learning experiences through a variety of ways, without specifying different types of approaches to learning. Taba believed that the use of different media --- aural, graphic, and kinesic --- is important.

Selecting learning experiences for a teacher education program will depend upon what has been shown to be effective practice for adult learning. The evidence established through research indicates that particular characteristics are associated with adult learning. In a recent summary of this research, Christensen *et al.* (1983) identify several characteristics of adult learners: they show a problem-centred orientation; they show preferences to redefine a problem during the process of learning; their initiation into the learning sequence is often through identifying its relationship to experiences; they have varying personalities, physical and social experiences which must be recognised; they are judgmental; and they

...93

Table 9: Organisation of the Learning Experiences for the Teacher Education Program

Topic	Content	Learning Experiences
1. The characteristics of bilingual-bicultural and multicultural curriculum materials		1.1 Introductory
	1.1.1 linguistic content	1.1.1.1 Ask the participants to answer: Why do you believe that it is important for the linguisti content to represent the standarc form of the second language in bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials?
	1.1.2 language level	1.1.2.1 Ask the participants to answer: Why do you believe that it is important for the language level of bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials to be consistent with the development of the skills of individual learners?
	1.1.3 bias in the illustrations	1.1.3.1 Ask the participants to answer: Why do you believe that it is important for portrayals of people of minority groups, depicted in illustrations of curriculum materials, to reflect their cultures and experiences accurately?
	1.1.4 bias in the written content	1.1.4.1 Ask the participants to answer: Why do you believe that it is important for portrayals of people of minority cultures in the written content of curriculum materials to reflect their cultures and experiences accurately?
		1.2 Development, analysis and study
	1.2.1 linguistic content	1.2.1.1 Ask each participant to complete Exercise 1.2.1.
	1.2.2 language level	1.2.2.1 Ask each participant to complete Exercise 1.2.2.
	1.2.3 bias in the illustrations	1.2.3.1 Ask each participant to complete Exercise 1.2.3.
	1.2.4 bias in the written content	1.2.4.1 Ask each participant to complete Exercise 1.2.4.
		1.3 Generalisation
	1.3.1 linguistic content	1.3.1.1 Ask each participant to complete Exercise 1.3.1.
	1.3.2 language level	1.3.2.1 Ask each participant to complete Exercise 1.3.2.
	1.3.3 bias in the illustrations	1.3.3.1 Ask each participant to complete Exercise 1.3.3.
	1.3.4 bias in the written content	1.3.4.1 Ask each participant to complete Exercise 1.3.4.

Topic	Content	Learning Experiences
		1.4 Application
	1.4.1 linguistic content	1.4.1.1 Whilst working in an actual school situation, select instructional materials for your students that relate to their needs in linguistic content. For instance, if your students speak the standard form of the second language, select curriculu materials that are written only in the standard form. For a single lesson you are planning to teach, evaluate and select curriculum materials by applying the techniques specified in Exercise 1.2.1 and Exercise 1.3.1
	1.4.2 language level	1.4.2.1 Whilst working in an actual school situation, select instructional materials that match the language level of your students' use of the second language. For a single lesson that you are planning to teach, evaluate and select curriculum materials by applying the techniques specified in Exercise 1.2.2 and Exercise 1.3.2.
	1.4.3 bias in the illustrations	1.4.3.1 Whilst working in an actual school situation, select instructional materials in which the illustrations are unbiased. For a single lesson that you are planning to teach, evaluate and select curriculum materials by applying the techniques specifie in Exercise 1.2.3 and Exercise 1.3.3.
	1.4.4 bias in the written content	1.4.4.1 Whilst working in an actual school situation, select instructional materials in which the written content is unbiased. For a single lesson that you are planning to teach, evaluate and select curriculum materials by applying the techniques specifie in Exercise 1.2.4 and Exercise 1.3.4.

Exercise 1.2.1 and Exercise 1.3.1: Analysing the Linguistic Content in the Second Language of Bilingual-bicultural Curriculum Materials

Participant's Edition

Objective: To determine to what extent the linguistic content in the second language of a textbook is written in the standard form, a dialect, contains culturally charged vocabulary, or unacceptable morphological and syntactic forms.

Materials Needed:

1. A textbook that you use frequently with a group of students. The textbook should be appropriate to the age range of the particular students.

2. The Checklist, and The Evaluation Form

Instructions:

1. Examine the textbook to determine what teaching-learning approach has been adopted. Several, varying approaches are used for instruction in second languages:

--- grammar-translation (indirect) method;
--- cognitive code;
--- direct method;
--- audiolingual method;
--- audiovisual method;
--- natural approach;
--- total physical response;
--- suggestopedia;
--- the silent way;
--- counselling-learning;
--- eclectic approach; or
--- other method.

2. Select this textbook if the teaching-learning approach is compatible with the teaching-learning approach you intend to use with your group of students.

3. Select the appropriate section of the textbook you intend to present to your group of students. The contents of most second language textbooks will be sequenced from simple tasks to more difficult tasks.

4. Apply the following technique to examine the textbook:

Textbook : Determine if the linguistic content of the textbook is consistent with the linguistic forms used by the students in your group.

Note: Turn to the Checklist

5. List the page number of each exercise on the Checklist.

6. This task requires your judgment. For each exercise you have indicated, check the appropriate box on the Checklist under the headings: Dialect; Culturally Charged Language; and Unacceptable Language.

Note: Turn to the Evaluation Form

7. Referring to the Checklist, count the number of times you checked 'yes' for each of the characteristics. Record your tallies for each characteristic at Item 1, Item 2 and Item 3 on the Evaluation Form.

8. Show whether the language use in the second language of your students contains instances of dialect, culturally charged language, or unacceptable language.

9. Match your judgments about the use of each characteristic in the textbook, as indicated at Item 4, and the language use of your students, as indicated at Item 5.

10. If the characteristics of these two items match, check the appropriate box on Item 6 of the Evaluation Form. Select the textbook on the basis of this rating.

Exercise 1.2.1 and Exercise 1.3.1 Analysing the Linguistic Content in the Second Language of Bilingual-bicultural Curriculum Materials

Description of the Material

1. Book Title..

2. Author...

3. Publisher..

4. Place of Publication...

5. Date of Publication..

Exercise 1.2.1

Checklist

1. State the page number of each instructional exercise.

2. State whether each instructional exercise presents instances of dialect, culturally-charged language and unacceptable language. Check the appropriate box for the characteristic which you believe is presented in the exercise.

No.	Page No.	Dialect		Culturally-charged		Unacceptable	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							
11.							
12.							
13.							
14.							
15.							
16.							
17.							
18.							
19.							
20.							

Evaluation Form

1. State the total number of times you checked 'yes' for Dialect

   ....

2. State the total number of times you checked 'yes' for Culturally Charged Language

   ....

3. State the total number of times you checked 'yes' for Unacceptable Language

   ....

4. State the percentage of times you checked 'yes' for:

   - dialect..%
   - culturally charged language............................%
   - unacceptable language.................................%

5. Check for instances of each characteristic in the language use of your students.

   dialect

   culturally charged language

   unacceptable morphology and syntax

6. Check the box that corresponds to your answers.

70% - 100%	☐ dialect ☐ culturally charged language ☐ unacceptable language	High percentage of linguistic features that do not represent the standard form of the second language.
50% - 69%	☐ dialect ☐ culturally charged language ☐ unacceptable language	Moderate percentage of linguistic features that do not represent the standard form of the second language.
less than 50%	☐ dialect ☐ culturally charged language ☐ unacceptable language	Low percentage of linguistic features that do not represent the standard form of the second language.

Exercise 1.2.2 and Exercise 1.3.2: Analysing the Language Level of the Content in the Second Language of Bilingual-bicultural Curriculum Materials

Participant's Edition

Objective: To determine to what extent the language in the second language of a textbook is suitable for a beginner, an intermediate learner or for an advanced learner.

Materials Needed:

1. A textbook that you use frequently with a group of students. The textbook should be appropriate to the age range of the particular students.

2. The Checklist, the Evaluation Form, and the Rating Form.

Instructions:

3. Examine the textbook to determine what teaching-learning approach has been adopted. Several varying approaches are used for instruction in second languages:
--- grammar-translation (or indirect) method;
--- cognitive code;
--- direct method;
--- audiolingual method;
--- audiovisual method;
--- natural approach;
--- total physical response;
--- suggestopedia;
--- the silent way;
--- counselling-learning;
--- eclectic approach; or
--- other method.

4. Select this textbook if the teaching-learning approach is compatible with the teaching-learning approach you intend to use with your group of students.

5. Select an appropriate section of the textbook you wish to present to your group of students. The contents of most second language textbooks will be sequenced from more simple tasks to more difficult tasks. You should select student instructional exercises that present a balance between listening skills, speaking skills, reading skills, or writing skills.

6. If this textbook fulfils this need, apply the following technique:

Section 1: Determine if the presentation of listening skills is appropriate to the language level of individual students in your group.

Section 2: Determine if the presentation of speaking skills is appropriate to the language level of individual students in your group.

Section 3: Determine if the presentation of reading skills is appropriate to the language level of individual students in your group.

Section 4: Determine if the presentation of writing skills is appropriate to the language level of individual students in your group.

Note: Turn to the Checklist.

7. List the page number of each exercise on the Checklist.

8. This task requires your judgment. For each exercise you have indicated, check the appropriate box at the appropriate level on the Checklist under the headings: Listening; Speaking; Reading; and Writing.

Note: Turn to the Evaluation Form.

9. Referring to the Checklist, count the number of times you checked 'yes' for each level within each skill. Record your tallies for each level at Item 1, Item 2, Item 3 or Item 4 on the Evaluation Form.

10. For each skill, select the level for which the highest score is indicated. Convert the scores to percentages. Indicate each percentage on the appropriate level at Item 5 on the Evaluation Form.

11. Check the appropriate language level of each skill at which you judge your group of students has attained.

12. For each skill, match your judgment of the language level checked on Item 6 of the Evaluation Form with the language level for the textbook indicated at Item 5 of the Evaluation Form. If the levels for these two items match, check the appropriate box on Item 7 of the Evaluation Form. Select the appropriate exercises for each skill on the basis of the evaluations given at Item 7.

Exercise 1.2.2 Analysing the Language Level of the Content in the Second Language of Bilingual-bicultural Curriculum Materials.

Description of the Material

1. Book Title ....

2. Author ....

3. Publisher ....

4. Place of Publication ....

5. Date of Publication ....

Exercise 1.2.2 Checklist

1. State the page number of each instructional exercise.

2. State whether each instructional exercise presents listening skills, speaking skills, reading skills or writing skills.
   Check the appropriate box for the level in which you believe the exercise is presented.

No.	Page No.	Listening			Speaking			Reading			Writing		
		Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced
1.													
2.													
3.													
4.													
5.													
6.													
7.													
8.													
9.													
10.													

Exercise 1.3.2.

Evaluation Form

1. State the total number of times you checked 'yes' for Listening at the:

beginner level ....
intermediate level ....
advanced level ....

2. State the total number of times you checked 'yes' for Speaking at the:

beginner level ....
intermediate level ....
advanced level ....

3. State the total number of times you checked 'yes' for Reading at the:

beginner level ....
intermediate level ....
advanced level ....

4. State the total number of times you checked 'yes' for Writing at the:

beginner level ....
intermediate level ....
advanced level ....

5. In each case, select the level for which the highest score is indicated. Convert this score to a percentage. State the number of times you checked 'yes' for:

listening at ....% for the ....level
speaking at ....% for the ....level
reading at ....% for the ....level
writing at ....% for the ....level

6. Check the language level of the students in your group for:

listening:	beginner	☐
	intermediate	☐
	advanced	☐
speaking:	beginner	☐
	intermediate	☐
	advanced	☐
reading:	beginner	☐
	intermediate	☐
	advanced	☐
writing:	beginner	☐
	intermediate	☐
	advanced	☐

7. Check the box that corresponds to your answers:

70%-100%	☐ Listening ☐ Speaking ☐ Reading ☐ Writing	Excellent percentage of skills at this level
50%-69%	☐ Listening ☐ Speaking ☐ Reading ☐ Writing	Standard percentage of skills at this level
less than 50%	☐ Listening ☐ Speaking ☐ Reading ☐ Writing	Inadequate percentage of skills at this level

Exercise 1.2.3 and Exercise 1.3.3: Analysing Illustrations in Bilingual-bicultural and Multicultural Curriculum Materials[1]

Participant's Edition

Objective: To determine to what extent the illustrations in a textbook include realistic portrayals of people of a particular culture.

Materials Needed:

1. A textbook that you use frequently with a group of students. The textbook should be appropriate to the age range of the particular students.

2. The Checklist, the Evaluation Form, and the Rating Form.

Instructions:

1. Skim through the textbook quickly to see whether the illustrations depict people of a particular culture that you wish your students to study.

2. If this textbook fulfils this need, select this book and apply the following techniques:

   Technique 1: Determine if there is an adequate percentage of illustrations depicting people of the particular culture.

   Technique 2: Determine if the illustrations depicting people of the particular culture show a realistic representation of the particular culture.

Note: Turn to the Checklist.

Technique 1

3. Starting at the title page of the textbook, count each illustration that includes people.

4. After you complete the count, record on the Checklist the number of illustrations that show people.

Technique 2

5. Start again at the title page of the book. List the page number of each illustration that shows people of the particular culture. The page number should be listed on the Checklist. Also record the number of illustrations that depict people of the particular culture.

6. Calculate the percentage of illustrations depicting people of the particular culture. Record the percentage on the Checklist.

7. For each illustration depicting people of the particular culture, determine whether it depicts accurately their

   --- living conditions.
   --- occupational roles.
   --- characterisation.
   --- physical features.

8. This task requires your judgment. Check the appropriate box on the Checklist under the headings: Living Conditions; Occupational Roles; Characterisation; and Physical Features.

Note: Turn to the Evaluation Form

Technique 1

9. Divide the number you recorded for Item 2 on the Checklist by the number you recorded for Item 1 on the Checklist. Convert the fraction to a percentage. Record the percentage at Item 1 on the Evaluation Form.

10. Estimate the quantity of illustrations depicting people of the particular culture at Item 2 on the Evaluation Form.

Technique 2

11. Referring to the Checklist, count the number of times you checked 'yes' for each of the four characteristics. Record your tallies for each at Item 3, Item 4, Item 5 or Item 6 on the Evaluation Form.

12. Calculate the percentage of times you checked 'yes' for each characteristic. Record the percentage for each characteristic at Item 7 on the Evaluation Form.

13. Estimate the quantity for each characteristic at Item 8 on the Evaluation Form.

Note: Turn to the Rating Form

Technique 1 and Technique 2

14. Score each characteristic at Item 1 on the Rating Form.

15. Rate the illustrations in the textbook at Item 2 on the Rating Form.

---

[1] This topic has been developed from the module published by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Exercise 1.2.3 Analysing Illustrations in Bilingual-Bicultural and Multicultural Curriculum Materials

Description of the Material

1. Book Title ....
2. Author ....
3. Publisher ....
4. Place of Publication ....
5. Date of Publication ....

Checklist

Exercise 1.2.3

Technique 1:

1. State the number of illustrations depicting people.
2. State the number of illustrations depicting people of the particular culture.

Technique 2:

3. State the page number of each illustration depicting people of a particular culture.
4. State whether each illustration depicts living conditions, occupational roles, characterisation, and physical features. Check the appropriate box.

Exercise 1.3.3 Rating Form

No.	Page No.	Living Conditions			Occupational Roles			Characterisation			Physical Features		
		yes	no	n/a	yes	no	n/a	yes	no	n/a	yes	no	n/a
1.													
2.													
3.													
4.													
5.													
6.													
7.													
8.													
9.													
10.													
11.													
12.													
13.													
14.													
15.													
16.													
17.													
18.													
19.													
20.													
21.													
22.													
23.													
24.													
25.													

Exercise 1.3.3 **Evaluation Form**

Technique 1:

1. State the percentage of illustrations depicting people of a particular culture. ....%

2. Check the box that corresponds to your answer:

50% - 100%	Excellent percentage of illustrations depicting people of a particular culture.
20% - 49%	Standard percentage of illustrations depicting people of a particular culture.
less than 20%	Inadequate percentage of illustrations depicting people of a particular culture.

Technique 2:

3. State the total number of times you checked 'yes' for Living Conditions.

   ....

4. State the total number of times you checked 'yes' for Occupational Roles.

   ....

5. State the total number of times you checked 'yes' for Characterisation.

   ....

6. State the total number of times you checked 'yes' for Physical Features.

....

7. State the percentage of times you checked 'yes' for:

Living Conditions ....%

Occupational Roles ....%

Characterisation ....%

Physical Features ....%

8. Check the box that corresponds to your answers:

50 - 100%

☐ Living Conditions

☐ Occupational Roles

☐ Characterisation

☐ Physical Features

Excellent percentage of illustrations depicting people of a particular culture.

20% - 49%

☐ Living Conditions

☐ Occupational Roles

☐ Characterisation

☐ Physical Features

Standard percentage of illustrations depicting people of a particular culture.

less than 20%	Living Conditions Occupational Roles Characterisation Physical Features	Inadequate percentage of illustrations depicting people of a particular culture.

Technique 1 and Technique 2

1. Use the results of the information on the Evaluation Form to score the book you have analysed.

Area	Characteristic	Check appropriate box	Scoring
Technique 1	Illustrations depicting people of a particular	Excellent = 10	....
		Standard = 5	....
		Inadequate = 0	....
Technique 2	1 Living Conditions	Excellent = 10	....
		Standard = 5	....
		Inadequate = 0	....
	2 Occupational Roles	Excellent = 10	....
		Standard = 5	....
		Inadequate = 0	....
	3 Characterisation	Excellent = 10	....
		Standard = 5	....
		Inadequate = 0	....
	4 Physical Features	Excellent = 10	....
		Standard = 5	....
		Inadequate = 0	....
TOTAL SCORE			....

2. Rate the illustrations depicting people of the particular culture in the textbook.

Point Range	Textbook Rating
30-40	Excellent
20-29	Standard
0-19	Inadequate

Exercise 1.2.4 and Exercise 1.3.4 Analysing the Written Content in Bilingual-bicultural and Multicultural Curriculum Materials[1]

Teacher's Manual

Objective: To determine to what extent the written content in a textbook is racially biassed.

Materials Needed:

1. A textbook that you use frequently with a group of students in the range of grades 5 through 12. The textbook should be appropriate to the age range of the particular group of students.

2. The Evaluative Coefficient Score Sheet[2], and the Evaluative Coefficient Word List[3].

Instructions :

1. Skim through the textbook quickly to see whether the written content describes the culture that you wish your students to study.

2. If this textbook fulfils this need, select this book and apply the following technique:

> Technique: Determine if there is an adequate percentage of words that reflect the particular culture.

Note: Turn to the Evaluative Coefficient Score Sheet, and the Evaluative Coefficient Word List.

3. Complete the details about the textbook at the head of the Evaluative Coefficient Score Sheet. State the name of the particular culture being evaluated.

4. Select the appropriate section of the textbook you wish to present to your group of students.

5. Starting at the appropriate page of the textbook, read the section you intend presenting to your group of students. As you read the textbook, record all the words listed on the Evaluative Coefficient Word List that are found in the content of the textbook on the Evaluative Coefficient Score Sheet. The words you list may also be adjectives, adverbs, nouns or verbs derived from the words listed on the Evaluative Coefficient Word List.

6. Using the Evaluative Coefficient Word List, list a positive, neutral or negative value for each word you have listed on the Evaluative Coefficient Score Sheet. Where a word is negatively associated with a subject, the scoring should be reversed.

7. If you have written more than a minimum of ten words on the Evaluative Coefficient Score Sheet, calculate the coefficient of evaluation by using the formula: $\frac{100F}{F+U}$, where F=number of favourable terms, and U=number of unfavourable terms.

8. Rate the written content of the section of the textbook you have selected. The Coefficient of Evaluation will always be between 0 (totally unfavourable) and 100 (totally favourable) with 50 representing the point of neutrality.

---

[1] This topic has been developed from the publication by D. Pratt (1971), 'Value Judgments in Textbooks: the Coefficient of Evaluation as a Quantitative Measure', *Interchange*, 2:3, 7-9. The topic is printed in an adapted form with permission from The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

[2] See D. Pratt (1971), 8.

[3] See D. Pratt (1972), *How to Find and Measure Bias in Textbooks*, Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications, 39-44. The Evaluative Coefficient Word List cannot be printed in the Teacher's Manual because of a copyright restriction.

Exercise 1.2.4 **Analysing the Written Content in Bilingual-bicultural and Multicultural Curriculum Materials**

Description of the Material

1. Book Title..

2. Author..

3. Publisher..

4. Place of Publication..

5. Date of Publication..

1. Name of Group - Evaluative Coefficient Score Sheet

page	term	direction	page	term	direction
1.			21.		
2.			22.		
3.			23.		
4.			24.		
5.			25.		
6.			26.		
7.			27.		
8.			28.		
9.			29.		
10.			30.		
11.			31.		
12.			32.		
13.			33.		
14.			34.		
15.			35.		
16.			36.		
17.			37.		
18.			38.		
19.			39.		
20.			40.		

Score ....

Rate the written content of the particular culture

Point Range	Textbook Rating
60-100	Excellent
40-59	Standard
0-39	Inadequate

allocate their resources to activities on the basis to which these activities meet their needs. This situation is most successfully recognised by Charuhas among the writers of the teacher education materials available for the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials. The author has also endeavoured to take account of the prerequisites of effective practice for adult learners in organising the learning experiences of this teacher education program.

The organisation of the learning experiences for the first topic is presented in Table 9. In keeping with the intention of presenting a teacher education program for bilingual-bicultural and multicultural educators, only the learning experiences for the first topic are presented in this paper. It is expected that the learning experiences for the remaining topics would be developed and implemented in a context appropriate to all educators in a workshop.

4.3.5 Evaluating

When developing an instructional program, Taba emphasised that the perspective for student evaluation should consist of both formative and summative features. Taba also believed that these features should incorporate both the more informal means of assessment, such as observational techniques, and formal testing.

As previously mentioned, Willis, ED 125 654, has developed a set of tests to assess teachers' skills of selecting and evaluating computerised instructional materials. Several of the teacher education modules --- De Luca, ED 120 986; The Center for Vocational Education, ED 149 063; Hernandez and Melnick, ED 095 141; and Eberhardt and Lloyd, ED 106 753 --- described in Section 3.4, also contain, as part of their constructs, the means for student assessment. Aspects of these materials have been incorporated in the test specifications developed to assess students in this teacher education program.

Because the emphasis of this teacher education program has been placed upon the development of skills for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials, criterion-referenced testing is viewed as a particularly appropriate means for student assessment. Development of criterion-referenced test specifications for both formative and summative evaluations of student performances in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials, is directed to assessing the skills of bilingual-bicultural and multicultural educators specifically in relation to Topic 1.

Popham (1978) has specified a number of key operations in developing test specifications for criterion-referenced measures: defining the test's descriptive scheme; creating homogeneous item pools; determining the test's length; and improving the quality of the test's items. Each of these operations has been taken into account in developing the test specifications shown in Table 10. Following the procedures recommended by Popham, the test specifications include four of his five components.

1. General description: A description of the behaviour being assessed.
2. Sample item: A sample item that reflects the attributes of test items developed in the following two components.
3. Stimulus attributes: A set of criteria that specify the nature of the stimulus material that will be encountered by the examinee.
4. Response attributes: A set of criteria that either specify the classes of responses from which the examinee responds to test items, or specifies the standards by which the examinee's responses will be judged.
5. Specification supplement

4.3.6 Checking for Balance and Sequence

Taba emphasised the need for curriculum developers to check the congruence

...95

Table 10: Test Specifications for a Criterion-referenced Post-test for Summative Assessment of Topic 1

1. General Description

The participant reads descriptions about how bilingual-bicultural teachers went about analysing the linguistic content of language level of their textbooks, and how bilingual-bicultural and multicultural teachers went about analysing bias in the illustrations or the written content of their textbooks. Such analyses formed one basis upon which the teachers selected textbooks for use with their classes. In each case, the teachers in the descriptions either make specified errors or correctly conduct their analyses. The participant will select the error made or indicate that no error was made.

2. Sample Item

Directions: Read the description about how a multicultural teacher, named Mrs Kamperman, went about analysing and selecting a series of posters of people of different cultures she was intending to exhibit on display panels in her classroom.

If Mrs Kamperman makes an error in her behaviour when analysing and selecting the illustrations, write on the answer sheet the letter of the response alternative that matches the error described. If no error was made, write on the answer sheet the letter of that response alternative.

> Mrs Kamperman has been teaching a series of topics about the main ethnic groups of migrants --- Italians, Greeks, Yugoslavs, Germans and Dutch --- who settled in Australia during the years following World War II. The goal of her lessons has been to increase the intercultural understanding of her students about the multicultural nature of Australian communities. She believes a display of posters in illustrative form which she has collected over several years, would reinforce the goal of the lesson.
>
> Mrs Kamperman examines her collection for examples of illustrations of Dutch people who might have settled in Australia. She finds only two illustrations of people of Dutch origin: an illustration of a Dutch girl wearing traditional Marken costume; and an illustration of an Afrikaner farmer from South Africa. Mrs Kamperman selects the illustration of the Dutch girl wearing traditional Marken costume to represent Dutch settlers in Australia.

How would you judge Mrs Kamperman's selection of an appropriate illustration to reflect a Dutch settler in Australia?

A. Mrs Kamperman made the correct selection.
B. Mrs Kamperman should have selected the Afrikaner.
C. Mrs Kamperman should not display either illustration.
D. Mrs Kamperman should not display either illustration, but obtain illustrations from other sources.

3. Stimulus Attributes

3.1 Each item will relate to stimulus material containing a fictitious description of 200 words or less dealing with a named teacher selecting or evaluating curriculum materials.

3.2 The descriptions will include illustrations of the following behavioural factors that may influence selection and evaluation of particular aspects of curriculum materials. These criteria apply to

particular types of curriculum materials.
3.2.1 teaching-learning approach: The teaching-learning approach used when either the linguistic content or the language level of second language material is being analysed.
3.2.2 linguistic content: The use of linguistic content must be appropriate to the students' language use.
3.2.3 language level: The language level must be appropriate to the level of the students' language use.
3.2.4 bias in the illustrations: Illustrations in bilingual-bicultural and multicultural curriculum materials must accurately reflect the living conditions, occupational roles, characterisation and physical features of people of a particular culture.
3.2.5 bias in the written content: Emotive words must be identified to eliminate bias in the written content.

3.3 The description may illustrate completely correct behaviour, or one of the behavioural factors illustrated may exemplify erroneous behaviour, whereas the remainder of the description exemplifies correct behaviour. No more than 20 percent of the test items will exemplify completely correct behaviour.

3.4 The description may include direct quotation of the selector or evaluator, as well as descriptions of their actions.

3.5 If several descriptions are used in a test, the names given to selectors or evaluators will be evenly divided between male and female, and will include some named characteristic of the most common ethnic groups in the population to be tested. The name to be used with the description will be chosen at random so that discrimination cannot be made on the basis of sex or ethnic group.

4. Response Attributes
4.1 The examinees will mark on their answer sheets the letter that corresponds to the error made by the selector or evaluator, or the statement indicating that no error was made.

4.2 There will be four alternatives, consisting of the correct response and three distractors. The options will include a response indicating that no error was made, together with characteristics of one of the following behaviours: inappropriate linguistic content; inappropriate language use; bias in the illustrations; or bias in the written content. The three behavioural factors chosen will correspond to three of the factors illustrated in the stimulus material.

4.3 The correct response will be that alternative that correctly names the error illustrated in the description, or, in the case that no error was illustrated, that alternative indicating that no error was made.

established between the constructs of the curriculum. This involves checking that the balance between the objectives, content, learning experiences and the means of evaluation matches. Checking should also be undertaken to establish the sequence between the elements of the different constructs. Moreover, the check should extend to screening the quality of the content so that it can be adequately presented in the time available in a workshop.

Whereas checking for balance and sequence is conducted during the planning stage, additional forms of validation are needed before a program is implemented. These forms of validation --- pilot-trialling, pilot-testing, field-trialling or field-testing --- should be conducted to determine the extent to which the balance and sequence, as well as other features of the program, can be verified in educational contexts by applying both objective and subjective techniques of evaluation. Such prerequisites for checking the balance and sequence of the curricular constructs of a module, that may be developed from the program discussed in Chapter 4, need to be met before its implementation.

4.4 Conclusion

In presenting a proposal for a teacher education program in this chapter, the author has not attempted to develop a sequence of modules that can be immediately used in a workshop to guide participants through the constructs of the curriculum. The program, however, does present the essential form for the constructs of the curriculum, whereby modules for a teacher education course can be developed.

The program is intended to be used by a curriculum developer to design modules that will match specific educational contexts for which they are intended.

...96

The author believes that a curriculum developer, undertaking such an activity, would be expected to take account of the different models and approaches for implementing the teacher education program as discussed in Chapter 5.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSAL FOR A TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

5.1 Teacher Education in Tasmania

The National Inquiry into Teacher Education (1980) has described the nature and provision of inservice teacher education in Australia. The committee responsible for this report identified three types of inservice education: formal award-based inservice courses, including degree and diploma courses, at tertiary institutions; non-award-based inservice courses of two types --- non-award-based courses and short, 'once only' activities; and informal inservice education --- home-school liaison, work with community organisations, work experience and professional reading. This situation is substantiated by the series of reviews of teacher education conducted in most Australian states: Queensland (Committee appointed by the Board of Advanced Education and the Board of Teacher Education, 1978); New South Wales (Committee to examine Teacher Education in New South Wales, 1980); South Australia (South Australian Enquiry into Teacher Education, 1980); Western Australia (Committee of Enquiry into Teacher Education, 1980); and Victoria (Committee of the Victorian Enquiry into Teacher Education, 1980).

Unlike other Australian states, there has been no official inquiry into teacher education conducted in Tasmania. Despite this, the development of teacher education in Tasmania has shown distinctive characteristics which have not occurred in other Australian states. The activity of the state education department in inservice teacher education in Tasmania is divided into two main divisions: the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers, which provides formal award-based degree courses through tertiary institutions; and General Programs, which provide non-award-based programs of both short activities and longer courses. The development and nature of each of these divisions are examined below.

...98

5.1.1 The Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers

The Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers is a cooperative agency representing a collaborative use of personnel and resources between the Education Department of Tasmania, The University of Tasmania and the Tasmanian State Institute of Technology. A board of management composed of equal representation from these three institutions, together with representatives from teachers' unions and independent schools, is responsible for determining policies. An executive committee comprising board members from each of the institutions is responsible for implementing these policies.

The Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers evolved from an informal linkage between teachers colleges and the Education Department of Tasmania, which together provided inservice teacher education courses for requirements of minimum certification. In 1967, the Teachers Colleges Board of Studies assumed responsibility for administering and coordinating these courses. Between 1968 and 1980, the program of courses was expanded, and when the Tasmanian College of Advanced Education (now the Tasmanian State Institute of Technology) assumed responsibility from the teachers colleges for preservice education of teachers, a collaborative arrangement was established between this institution and the Education Department of Tasmania. During 1979 and 1980, rationalisation of teacher education occurred in Tasmania through the creation of the Centre for Education at the University of Tasmania. The Centre for Education incorporated the division of teacher education of the Tasmanian College of Advanced Education in southern Tasmania, formerly located at Mount Nelson, and the faculty of education of The University of Tasmania. This development led to The University of Tasmania becoming involved in inservice education through the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers, and a tripartite collaboration between these three institutions was established and has continued.

...99

The courses offered through the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers are developed through advisory committees. Once needs are defined by schools, subject associations or tertiary institutions, the board of management initiates development of courses. Advisory committees, consisting of representatives from tertiary institutions and teachers, prepare course outlines containing statements about intents, contents, methodologies and references. Once accepted by the board of management, course outlines are referred to tertiary institutions for accreditation. A similar procedure is adopted for periodic review of all subjects.

Courses developed through this process consist of three types: foundation studies; advanced studies; and a senior staff development program. Foundation studies consist of approved subjects for qualification in the Tasmanian Teachers Certificate. Advanced studies, consisting of the bulk of the courses, are designed for qualification in a bachelor of education degree. Although they do not run concurrently, advanced studies' coursework subjects have been developed and implemented for thirty-seven subjects. The Senior Staff Development Program comprises of courses designed for qualification in either a bachelor of education degree or a master of education degree. Subjects have been developed and implemented for for five courses. These courses are listed in Appendix .

An important feature of the provision of these courses is their offering at all major urban centres in Tasmania. Most courses are regularly offered in the two major cities in Tasmania: Hobart, the state capital, situated in southern Tasmania; and Launceston, situated in northern Tasmania. Courses are also offered at other major towns: Burnie, Devonport, Ulverstone, Smithton, Scottsdale, Queenstown, Rosebery, and Huonville.

...100

5.1.2 General Programs

General programs can be grouped into three types: the School Improvement Program; short courses; and public service staff development activities. The School Improvement Program, introduced in 1982, funds school-based projects within guidelines specified by the Commonwealth Schools Commission. The major features of such projects are that they provide an adult learning experience; develop participants' knowledge, skills and attitudes; involve a school community; specify a rationale, objectives, methodologies, and a means of evaluation; can be completed within a school year; and can be maintained by the school without assistance.

Seminars provided through short courses are generally organised at regional teachers centres in Tasmania. These short courses are also linked to guidelines and funded by the Commonwealth Schools Commission.

Public service staff development activities involve a combination of formal award-bearing courses provided through tertiary institutions by the Assisted Study Program, and short courses. Short courses are designed for organisational, group and individual inservice development.

5.2 Models and Approaches for Teacher Education

Three models and three approaches are presented in this paper for implementing a training workshop that has been developed from the teacher education program proposed in Chapter 4.

The three models are termed in this paper: the formal award-bearing model; the informal non-award-bearing model; and the tutor-training model. The formal award-bearing model will be examined in the context of the program offered by the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers in Tasmania, whilst the informal non-award-bearing model will be examined in terms of the general programs provided through the Education Department of Tasmania. The third model, termed tutor-training, will be considered in light of reviews of its implementation in reading programs in New Zealand and Australia.

These three models for implementing a teacher education program have been selected because they have been implemented, or are being implemented, generally by academic institutions and educational agencies in Australia. The three models represent only a small proportion of techniques for implementing teacher education programs. Two models for implementing teacher education programs, that have been recently developed in the United States, are discussed below because of their implications for application to implementing inservice teacher education for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials.

The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute (1986b) states that its policy for utilisation of educational materials should be implemented through a planned model for teacher education, such as proposed by Joyce and Showers (1983). In this model, Joyce and Showers propose that five elements should be included in the training process: forecasting the problem of transfer of skills to the workplace; developing very high degrees of skill prior to classroom practice; providing the skill to select an appropriate strategy for application of skills in the classroom; providing for practice in the workplace immediately following skill development; and providing for 'coaching' by peers where skills learnt must be adapted to conditions in the workplace.

...102

Hunter (1983) has developed a model, known by several names --- A Clinical Theory of Instruction, Mastery Teaching, Clinical Teaching, Target Teaching, the UCLA model or the Hunter model --- which can be specifically applied to increase the effectiveness of the skills teachers use to select and to evaluate materials for classroom use. The explicit supervisory aspect of this model could be applied to monitoring teachers' applications to selecting and evaluating curriculum materials through development of an assessment instrument akin to the Teaching Appraisal for Instructional Improvement Instrument, developed by Hunter to diagnose professional performances of teachers.

The three approaches are termed in this paper: the curriculum studies approach; the subject-oriented approach; and the multidisciplinary, team teaching approach. The rationale and development for each of these approaches are discussed below.

A curriculum studies approach endeavours to adopt a generic approach to the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials without direct reference to content areas, whilst a subject-oriented approach is specifically confined to the characteristics of the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials within a particular content area. The limitations of both these approaches, representing polarised positions, had prompted Eraut *et al.* to propose a multidisciplinary, team teaching approach, which provides a compromise by applying subject-oriented expertise through team teaching.

In the discussion about each model, application of a curriculum studies approach, a subject-oriented approach or a multidisciplinary, team teaching approach, will be considered. Discussion of the subject-oriented approach within each of the three models will be directed to consideration of the

...103

selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education.

5.2.1 The Formal Award-bearing Model

Despite the predominant position of formal-award bearing courses in teacher education programs in Australian, as well as overseas, educational institutions, few examples of formal award-bearing courses that aim to develop teachers' knowledge and skills about selecting and evaluating curriculum materials have been documented. Morrissett *et al.* report instances of the use of the *Curriculum Materials Analysis System* for training evaluators of curriculum materials conducted at Purdue University and the University of Colorado. As reported by Hechinger (1980), fewer than five percent of over 120 teacher training institutions in the United States surveyed by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute offered courses to train teachers to select curriculum materials. Eraut *et al.* provide detailed information about the higher degree program for evaluating curriculum materials offered at the University of Sussex, England.

Each of the three approaches could be applied to implementing a course for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials within a teacher education program adopting a formal award-bearing model. Within this paper, the subject, Language Development and Multicultural Education, offered by the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers in Tasmania, has been chosen as a suitable course for discussing implementation of a subject-oriented approach. Each approach will be discussed separately in the context of the teacher education program offered by the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers.

...104

5.2.1.1 The Curriculum Studies Approach

The difficulties of successfully implementing a curriculum studies approach to the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials in a teacher education program have been referred to in the discussion about the formal, award-bearing course at Sussex University described by Eraut *et al.* Despite the likelihood of a curriculum studies approach degenerating either towards superficiality or elevating towards theoretical considerations, it is possible that this approach would be seen as appropriate to the departmental organisation of most tertiary institutions in Australia.

However, given the organisation of courses provided by the University of Tasmania and the Tasmanian State Institute of Technology through the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers, it seems that application of this approach would be less appropriate than the alternative approaches. It should be noted, as reported in section 4.2.1, that this approach was overwhelmingly rejected by the coordinators of courses offered through the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers.

The author believes that the teacher education program presented in Chapter 4 could be implemented through a curriculum studies approach within a formal, award-bearing context if the reservations noted by Eraut *et al.* are taken into account. To avoid the course degenerating toward superficiality or elevating toward theoretical considerations, features from other approaches --- the presentation of curriculum analysis through both team teaching within different subject areas, and course coordination within the generic aspects --- need to be amalgamated in a curriculum studies approach.

...105

5.2.1.2 The Subject-oriented Approach

It would be feasible for the subject-oriented approach, preferably modified by the conclusions derived from writers discussed in this document, to be adopted in the course, Language Development and Multicultural Education, offered through the Centre for Continuing Education of Teachers.

The course is presently content-oriented and consists of three topics: the first titled the ethnic dimension; the second titled approaches to language study; and the third titled teaching English-as-a-second-language. Within the third topic, some attention is given to curriculum materials used in the teaching of English-as-a-second-language. Certain dimensions --- those appropriate to the needs of teachers of English-as-a-second-language --- of the topics developed as part of the content of the teacher education program presented in Chapter 4, could be adapted for implementation in the course as a means of developing participants' skills to select and evaluate curriculum materials for English-as-a-second-language programs in Tasmanian schools.

5.2.1.3 The Multidisciplinary, Team Teaching Approach

Eraut *et al.* report the successful implementation of a multidisciplinary, team teaching approach within a one-week workshop, part of a formal award-bearing course at the University of Sussex. As a result, this group declared that five guidelines should be followed in curriculum analysis workshops: firstly, that analysis should be conducted in small groups; secondly, that the participants' choices of materials should be based on their needs; thirdly, that participants should complete the first draft of an analysis within the week; fourthly, that structured input from the workshop leader should be minimal; and lastly, that the role of the workshop leader

...106

should be that of a process-helper rather than an expert.

Advocacy of a small group, participant-centred form of the multidisciplinary, team teaching approach is valid when an instrument such as the Sussex Scheme, which applies an interaction model for curriculum development to the analysis of curriculum materials and an emphasis upon the decision making function, is used in a workshop. It may not be appropriate, however, when instruments, such as the *Curriculum Materials Analysis System* used by the Social Science Education Consortium or versions of EPIEform A used by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, that apply an objectives model for curriculum development to the analysis of curriculum materials, are used in a workshop.

The teacher education program presented in Chapter 4 has been developed so that it may be implemented in a workshop by means of a multidisciplinary, team teaching approach. Curriculum analysis within different subject areas is to be introduced to small groups of participants through the multidisciplinary team teaching approach in Topic 1. Participants are to be selected on the basis of their expertise in a subject area for inclusion in a small group. The guidelines developed by Eraut *et al.* can be adhered to in the presentation of Topic 1 although participants are not required to complete an analysis of a curriculum material within a specified time limit, but rather to complete the designated exercises for Topic 1.

Topic 2, Topic 3 and Topic 4 are oriented towards the generic aspects of selecting and evaluating curriculum materials. Although it is appropriate for the team leader in the teaching team to present the content of each of these topics to the participants, expertise in particular subject areas should be applied to focus upon the practical aspects of the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials.

...107

5.2.2 The Informal Non-award-bearing Model

The informal non-award-bearing model has only been applied to 'once only', short courses of one to five days duration, in the inservice teacher education program in Tasmania. In this situation, these courses have been introductory in nature.

The informal non-award-bearing model should only be applied to introductory courses directed to teacher education in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials. Such a course, however, could play a significant part to introduce techniques for selecting, adopting, utilising and evaluating curriculum materials to Australian teachers. This is likely to be most successfully achieved if introductory 'stand alone' modules are developed for each of these topics, as part of a more intensive teacher education program.

Both the curriculum studies approach and the subject-oriented approach could be applied, once such introductory 'stand alone' modules had been developed. The curriculum studies approach would be best suited to a short, one- or two-day workshop, to introduce techniques for selecting, adopting, utilising and evaluating curriculum materials. On the other hand, the subject-oriented approach is more appropriate for introducing to groups of teachers, each of whom possesses expertise in the same subject area, techniques and characteristics for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials that apply specifically to their subject area. For instance, the subject-oriented approach may be applied to develop a short, 'stand alone' module that would encompass Topic 1 of the teacher education program presented in Chapter 4. Since the multidisciplinary, team teaching approach is most suited for use in workshops that are part of an extended teacher education program of not less than a week's duration, this approach is probably less

...108

adaptable to use in the informal non-award-bearing model, as this model is applied in Tasmania and other Australian states.

5.2.3 The Tutor Training Model

The tutor training model, proposed in this paper as a means for developing and implementing a teacher education program to improve teachers' skills in the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education, had its origins in inservice programs developed and implemented nationally in New Zealand. These programs are the Early Reading Inservice Course directed to the early childhood level, the Later Reading Inservice Course directed to the middle and upper years of primary schooling, and Reading Recovery directed to children at risk in reading development.

The first two programs were implemented during 1978. Teacher education is a predominant feature of each. Hill (n.d.) has reported upon the important characteristics of teacher education involved in each program. Hill indicates the following characteristics of teacher education associated with the Early Reading Inservice Course.

> 'The ERIC course consists of twelve units of work taken at weekly intervals. Each unit is designed to be viewed individually, at a specifically prepared centre, where multiple copies of each unit and audio visual facilities are available. The program consists of slides, film strips, tapes and booklets .....' (Hill, 12).

This teacher education aspect of the Early Reading Inservice Course appears to have been particularly successful. Following an evaluation of the program, Turner (1982) reported that more than ninety percent of New Zealand teachers of junior classes had participated in the course.

...109

Hill indicates the following characteristics of teacher education associated with the Later Reading Inservice Course developed at the Christchurch Teachers College, South Island, New Zealand.

> 'LARIC consists of ten units of work presented by trained tutors at weekly intervals to groups of up to ten teachers at small centres or in classrooms. A large part of the LARIC program focusses on teaching demonstrations on video tapes and teaching practice decribed in unit booklets. The videos were made of teachers in many parts of New Zealand in rural and urban schools. The LARIC program consists of teachers viewing the video tapes, discussing classroom practice with other classroom teachers and with the tutor. The content of the unit booklet is discussed in groups; then unit activities and relevant readings are taken away for further reading and application in the classroom' (Hill, 14).

Reading Recovery was first introduced to Auckland schools during 1979. The program aims to diagnose reading difficulties of children who have the lowest level of achievement at their sixth birthday. Specific teaching techniques are then implemented to improve the performance of identified children. Like the Later Reading Inservice Course, the tutor training model has been fully implemented to train Reading Recovery teachers.

As a result of New Zealand experience with these courses, an Early Literacy Inservice Course was developed and implemented by the Education Department of South Australia during 1983-1984. The Early Literacy Inservice Course retains several similarities to the teacher development practices of the New Zealand programs. Hill lists the following principles for teacher education: theory is presented as the underpinning of practice; the program builds on, and recognises, existing practices; staff in leadership positions are to support the program's implementation; a network of tutors, who are classroom teachers, support teachers in their schools; involvement by a groups of teachers from the same schools in the program; the use of a variety of media in presenting the course; effective tutor training; and teachers becoming learners and researchers.

...110

In 1984, a tutor training program, similar to the Later Reading Inservice Course in New Zealand, was implemented and evaluated in South Australia. The teacher education program is designed to operate at two levels: the training of tutors; and the training of teachers. A tutor's manual, a set of overhead transparencies, unit booklets, video tapes and audio tapes have been developed for use in the teacher education program. The modifications ensuing from the evaluation formed the basis for national implementation of the program in all Australian states and territories during 1985, excepting in Queensland and Western Australia which opted to develop alternative programs.

Extension of the tutor training model outside reading development has not been reported. However, the nature of the tutor training model lends itself to adaptation for teacher education in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials particularly in geographical circumstances of sparsely distributed or undeveloped educational resources. The capability of the two levels of teacher development in the tutor training model to be used to communicate, to train and to disseminate materials to a large number of teachers at low cost is its conspicuous feature. The model is particularly apt to the practices of bilingual-bicultural education in the United States, Canada and Australia where a considerable proportion of non-English speaking groups, to which these programs are directed, live in the most remote and sparsely serviced localities.

The characteristics of the tutor training model determine the extent to which each of the three approaches can be applied to developing and implementing a teacher education program in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials. Each of the three approaches can be applied, preferably in combination, to the tutor training model. Both the curriculum studies approach to curriculum analysis and the subject-oriented approach to curriculum analysis can be

...111

applied at each level of the tutor training model. The multidisciplinary, team teaching approach, however, seems particularly suited to the training of tutors which will occur at a central service centre. On such occasions, teams consisting of members with expertise in either curriculum analysis or a subject area can be used to train the tutors. Since the tutors are required to train groups of teachers, often in a situation that is isolated from an education service centre, they will need to draw upon aspects of both a curriculum studies approach and a subject-oriented approach.

5.3 Conclusion

Since the number of models and approaches that can be applied to implement a teacher education program is unlimited, it was essential to restrict the number considered. Only those models and approaches that the author knew had been implemented, or are being implemented, in Australia were examined. Techniques for teacher education developed in the United States, such as the models of Joyce and Showers or Hunter, were mentioned in relation to their current application in teacher education by the institutions discussed in Chapter 3. These models, however, provide valid techniques for presenting a teacher education program in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials.

The discussion presented in this chapter, however, is speculative. Although the author has presented arguments supporting or opposing the use of each of the models or approaches for successfully implementing a teacher education program in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials, the validity of of each model or approach cannot be judged until it is actually implemented in a teacher education program. This has not yet been attempted in Australia.

6. CONCLUSION

The preceding chapters of this paper have shown that some attention has been given to developing criteria and applying these criteria to evaluating curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education. The search for literature in this field and its subsequent analysis, indicated that most, if not all, the activities related to evaluating curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education have been undertaken in the United States. It was found that most activities had been conducted by two institutions: the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute and the Social Science Education Consortium.

The need for a systematic approach to selecting and evaluating curriculum materials for bilingual-bicultural education and multicultural education programs in Australian schools was stated by the Curriculum Development Centre (1980). There is little evidence to support a view that action has been taken in Australia to plan, implement and conduct selections and evaluations of bilingual-bicultural and multicultural curriculum materials that meet the standards recognised by overseas educational agencies specialising in this field.

The search through the databases of the Educational Resources Information Center also indicated that a large number of state educational agencies in the United States have developed guidelines for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials. Since most state governments in the United States have enacted legislation to establish and conduct textbook adoptions, selection committees have been formed and have applied such guidelines to textbook adoptions. In only one Australian state, South Australia, have

...113

guidelines been published for evaluating curriculum materials (Education Department of South Australia, 1984). These guidelines are intended to be applied to educational products developed by that agency and not to textbook adoptions. It can be concluded that, unless the critical issues for selecting, evaluating, adopting and utilising curriculum materials are more widely recognised by Australian educators, the prospect that these issues will be systematically addressed in the future, is unlikely.

Despite this conclusion, the potential to develop new services, or to modify existing services, in Australian education to deliver information about evaluations of curriculum materials undoubtedly exists. Recently, two developments in educational technology in Australia enhance the capacity to deliver these services to Australian schools if the issues, mentioned above, are recognised, tackled and acted upon. These two developments are, firstly, the planning and current implementation of the Australian Schools Catalogue Information Service, and secondly, the tentative planning for a national software database and clearinghouse. Although these initiatives are developing independently, the incorporation of valid standards and criteria to evaluate curriculum materials within the Australian Schools Catalogue Information Service and computer software in the national software database, would provide a basis for their rational integration. The nature and present extent of development of each of these initiatives are now discussed.

The Australian Schools Catalogue Information Service has been established to provide cataloguing services for Australian schools nationally, through the collaboration of state education departments, the National Catholic Education Commission, National Council of Independent Schools and the Commonwealth Schools Commission. In its report, the Australian Schools Catalogue

...114

Information Service (1986) states that the database and the systems for microfiche and catalogue card production have been developed and implemented. Presently, machine-readable catalogue records in AUSMARC tagged format are being delivered onto floppy disk. The Western Australian Educational Computing Consortium (1986) reports that, in addition to bibliographic data, as many as fourteen abstracts can also be entered for each item. These fields have been used to include evaluations of curriculum materials based upon those provided in *Scan*, the journal of the Library Services, New South Wales Department of Education and the New South Wales Curriculum Information Network.

In 1984, the Curriculum Development Centre funded the Western Australian Educational Computing Consortium to conduct a feasibility study to investigate developing and implementing the evaluation and cataloguing of educational software used in Australian schools. The project officer, John A. Winship, reviewed the current situation in Australia and undertook a study tour, visiting educational institutions in Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom. In the report, the Western Australian Educational Computing Consortium recommended that a national software clearinghouse be established, which would administer a database to provide information, reviews and evaluations of computer software for Australian schools. It was also recommended that state and local centres, involved in computer education, would support and assist the dissemination of reviews and evaluations provided by the national software clearinghouse.

In their reports, both the Western Australian Educational Computing Consortium and the Curriculum Development Centre foresaw the need to involve international experts to advise about the planning, the implementation and the conduct of the evaluation of computer courseware, in the first case, and bilingual-bicultural and multicultural curriculum materials, in the second case. There has, it seems, been little attempt by Australian

...115

educational institutions involved in these activities to initiate such contacts overseas with the aim of facilitating the development of these services.

Komoski indicates (personal communication) that 'if an appropriate Australian educational institution wished to work with EPIE to extend its services to serve the needs of Australian schools, EPIE would be very interested in exploring the means through which this could be done'. Since both of the Australian developments reported above are presently only at an initial stage of development and implementation, in the first case, and at a preliminary stage of development, in the second case, it may be feasible to incorporate services developed by an overseas educational agency, such as EPIE Institute, within either of these developments.

In contrast, the literature search and its subsequent analysis revealed that there was a paucity of professional materials that could be implemented in teacher education programs to promote improvement in the selection and the evaluation of curriculum materials. Further research indicated that few universities or other institutions of higher learning provided such programs. It was found that several of the most important developments to provide teacher education for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials were being conducted by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute.

It must be concluded that teacher education for improving the quality of selections and evaluations of curriculum materials has been particularly neglected. The prospect for improving this situation in Australia, as elsewhere, is not promising unless teachers can be persuaded that valid techniques should be developed or extended, and then applied to selecting

...116

a material. Instructions are supplied explaining each step in the

and evaluating the instructional materials they use with students in their classrooms. The work of such institutions as the Social Science Education Consortium and the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute do, however, hold the promise that both the techniques for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials and the development of teacher education programs can be promoted if the activities of these institutions become better known among Australian educators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ambert, A. N. and Melendez, S. E.
1985 *Bilingual Education: A Sourcebook*
New York: Garland Publishing.

Andersson, T. and Boyer, M.
1978 *Bilingual Schooling in the United States*
Austin: National Educational Laboratory Publishers.

Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs
1980 *Review of Multicultural and Migrant Education*
Melbourne: Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs.

Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs
1982 *Evaluation of Post-arrival Programs and Services*
Melbourne: Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs.

Australian Schools Catalogue Information Service
1986 *ASCIS Report*
Melbourne: Australian Schools Catalogue Information Service.

Banks, H. A.
1974 *Evaluation of an instructional program in training teachers to analyze educational materials for possible racial bias*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Banks, J. A.
1981 *Multiethnic Education: Theory and Practice*
Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Blanco, G. C.
1977 'The education perspective'. In: Center for Applied Linguistics *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Education*
Arlington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1-66
Also reprinted as : 'The implementation of bilingual/bicultural education programs in the United States'. In: Spolsky, B. and Cooper, R. L. (eds.) *Case Studies in Bilingual Education*
Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, 454-499, 1978.

Blaunstein, P.
1983 *An Overview of State Textbook Selection Procedures*
Speech presented at the National Forum on Excellence in Education, Indianapolis.

Bloom, B. S., Englehart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H. and Krathwohl, D. R.
1956 *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals* (Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain)
New York: David McKay.

Brady, L.
1983 *Curriculum Development in Australia: Presage, Process, Product*
Sydney: Prentice-Hall of Australia

...118

California State Department of Education
1984 *Instructional Materials Sunset Review Report. A Report to the California Legislature as required by Senate Bill 1155, Chapter 1250, Statutes of 1983*
Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

Charuhas, M. S.
1984 *A Closer Look at Books. A Self Instructive Guide to Selecting and Evaluating Materials*
De Kalb: Northern Illinois University; Chicago: Region I Adult Education Service Center.

Christensen, J., Burke, P. and Fessler, R.
1983 *Teacher Life-span Development: A Summary and Synthesis of the Literature*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Committee appointed by the Board of Advanced Education
1978 *1978 Review: Teacher Education in Queensland*
Brisbane: Board of Advanced Education and Board of Teacher Education.

Committee of Inquiry in Teacher Education
1980 *Teacher Education in Western Australia*
Perth: Education Department of Western Australia.

Committee of the Victorian Enquiry into Teacher Education
1980 *Teacher Education in Victoria*
Hawthorn: Victorian Enquiry into Teacher Education.

Committee to examine Teacher Education in New South Wales
1980 *Teachers for Tomorrow: Continuity, Challenge and Change in Teacher Education in New South Wales*
Sydney: Committee to examine Teacher Education in New South Wales.

Commonwealth Schools Commission
1975 *Report for the Triennium 1976-1978*
Canberra: Commonwealth Schools Commission.

Commonwealth Schools Commission
1985 *Quality and Equality*
Canberra: Commonwealth Schools Commission.

Cordasco, F.
1976 *Bilingual Schooling in the United States: A Sourcebook for Educational Personnel*
New York: McGraw Hill Book.

Curriculum Development Centre
1980 *Research Studies on Education for a Multicultural Society* (Occasional Paper No. 4)
Canberra: Curriculum Development Centre.

Davis, T. E. and Eckenrod, J. S.
1972 'A process for selecting instructional materials'.
Social Education, 36: 7, 714-717.

...119

De Luca, J.
1975 *Material Selection B-1 Evaluating and Selecting Learning Materials* (Document No. 10d, Revised. Independent Study Training Material for Professional Supervisory Competencies)
Austin: Texas Education Agency.

Department of Education
1975 *Inquiry into Schools of High Migrant Density 1974*
Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Department of Education
1976 *Report of the Committee on the Teaching of Migrant Languages in Schools*
Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Bicultural Education
1975 *Guide to Title VII ESEA Bilingual Bicultural Programs, 1974-1975*
Austin: Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Bicultural Education.

Duke, C. R.
1985 *A Look at Current State-wide Adoption Procedures*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Spring Conference, Houston.

Eash, M. J.
1972 'Developing an instrument for assessing instructional materials'. *Curriculum Theory Network*, (Monograph Supplement), 193-200.
Also in: Walberg, H. J. (ed.) *Evaluating Educational Performance: A Sourcebook of Methods, Instruments and Examples*
Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1974.

Eberhardt, N. A. and Lloyd, M. V.
1975 *The Assessment of Print Materials* (Individualized Inservice Packet No. 1: Teaching Teen Reading Series)
Columbus: Ohio State Department of Education

Education Department of South Australia
1984 *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Curriculum Publications*
Adelaide: Education Department of South Australia

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
n.d. *Curriculum/Content/Evaluation Correlation Module* (Leader's Edition)
Water Mill: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
1977 *EPIE Training Form I*
New York: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
1980 *National Institute of Education* (Final Report, NIE-G-79-0083)
New York: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
1985 *EPIEform* A (Textbook Analysis Form)
Water Mill: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute

...120

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
1986a *EPIE Institute Inservice Training Modules for Helping Schools to make Effective Use of the Degrees of Reading Power* (EPIE/DRP Training Workshops)
Water Mill: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute.

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
1986b 'Adoption vs. Utilization'. *EPIEgram Materials*, 14: 8, 1-4.

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
1986c 'Postscript: The TIE Project'. *EPIEgram Materials*, 14: 8, 4-6.

Elliott, D. L.
1985 personal communication

Eraut, M., Goad, L. and Smith, G.
1975 *The Analysis of Curriculum Materials* (University of Sussex Education Area Occasional Paper 2)
Brighton: University of Sussex.

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
1980 *Selecting Children's Books with Multicultural Perspective*
San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Gibson, M. A.
1976 'Approaches to multicultural education in the United States: some concepts and assumptions'. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 7: 4, 7-18.

Hechinger, F. M.
1980 'About education: study suggests texts are often inadequate'. *The New York Times*, 8 April.

Hernandez, A. and Melnick, S. L.
n.d. *Modular Sequence: English as a Second Language, Methods and Techniques* (TTP001.13. Evaluating and Adapting Materials)
West Hartford: Hartford University.

Hill, S.
n.d. *Early Literacy Inservice Course, Evaluation July-December 1984*
Canberra: Curriculum Development Centre.

Hunter, M.
1983 *Mastery Teaching*
El Segundo: Tip Publications.

Institute for Educational Development
1969 *Selection of Educational Products in the United States Public Schools*
New York: Institute for Educational Development.

Joyce, B. R. and Showers, B.
1983 *Power in Staff Development: Ensuring Transfer of Training*
Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kamhi, M. M.
1982 *Book and Materials Selection for School Libraries and Classrooms: Procedures, Challenges and Responses*
Chicago: American Library Association; Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; Washington: Association of American Publishers.

...121

Klein, M. F.
1978 *About Learning Materials*
Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Komoski, P. K.
1967 *Development of a System for an Educational Products Information Exchange*
New York: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute.

Komoski, P. K.
1974 'Learner verification: touchstone for instructional materials?'.
Educational Leadership, 31: 5, 397-399.

Komoski, P. K.
1980 *What Curriculum Leaders need to know about Selecting Instructional Materials*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Atlanta.

Komoski, P. K.
1986 personal communication

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S. and Masia, B. B.
1964 *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals* (Handbook 2: Affective Domain)
New York: David McKay.

Lawton, D., Gordon, P., Ing, M., Gibly, B., Pring, R. and Moore, T.
1978 *Theory and Practice of Curriculum Studies*
London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Mackey, W. F.
1977 'The evaluation of bilingual education'. In: Spolsky, B. and Cooper, R. (eds.) *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*
Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, 226-281.

Morrissett, I. and Stevens, W. W.
1967 *Steps in Curriculum Analysis Outline*
Boulder: Social Science Education Consortium.

Morrissett, I., Stevens, W. W. and Woodley, C. P.
1968 'A model for analyzing curriculum materials and classroom transactions'.
In: Fraser, D. McC. (ed.) *Social Studies Curriculum Development: Prospects and Problems* (39th Yearbook)
Washington: Council for the Social Studies, 229-276.

National Inquiry into Teacher Education
1980 *Report of the National Inquiry into Teacher Education*
Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Northern Territory Department of Education
1985 *Bilingual Accreditation Ongoing Report --- Shepherdson College*
Darwin: Northern Territory Department of Education.

Peters, R. S.
1966 *Ethics and Education*
London: George Allen and Unwin.

...122

Popham, W. J.
1978 *Criterion-referenced Measurement*
Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Pratt, D.
1980 *Curriculum Design and Development*
New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch.

Rabin, A. T.
1978 *A Comparison of Two Methods of In-service Programming for helping Content Area Teachers Select and Use Student Reading Materials*
Report based on Ed. D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services to Migrants
1978 *Report of the Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services for Migrants*
Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Saville, M. R. and Troike, R. C.
1978 *A Handbook of Bilingual Education*
Washington: TESOL.

Social Science Education Consortium
1971 *Curriculum Materials Analysis System*
Boulder: Social Science Education Consortium.

Social Science Education Consortium
1975 *Ethnic Studies Materials Analysis Instrument*
Boulder: Social Science Education Consortium.

South Australian Inquiry into Teacher Education
1980 *Report of the South Australian Enquiry into Teacher Education*
Kent Town: South Australian Enquiry into Teacher Education.

Stenhouse, L.
1975 *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*
London: Heinemann.

Stevens, W. W. and Fetsko, W.
1968 'A curriculum analysis system'.
Social Science Education Consortium Newsletter, 4.

Stevens, W. W. and Morrissett, I.
1967-1968 'A system for analyzing social science curricula'.
EPIE Forum 1, 4-5, 12-15.

Taba, H.
1962 *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice*
New York: Harcourt Brace and World.

Talmage, H.
1981 'Selecting instructional materials: part ii --- matching materials to needs'.
Curriculum Review, 20: 1, 9-13.

The Ohio State University
1977 *Professional Teacher Education Module Series: Select Student Instructional Materials* (Module B-5 of Category B --- Instructional Planning)
Columbus: The Ohio State University.

Turner, H.
1982 *An Evaluation Study of the Early Reading Inservice Course* (ERIC)
Wellington: New Zealand Education Department.

Tyler, R. W.
1949 *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tyler, R. W.
1950 *Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wentling, T. L. and Piland, W. E.
1982 *Evaluating Instructional Materials* (Local Leader Guide IX. Locally-directed Evaluation Handbook)
Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education.

Western Australian Educational Computing Consortium
1986 *National Software Clearinghouse Feasibility Study: Report to Commonwealth Curriculum Development Centre*
Bentley: Western Australian Institute of Technology.

Willis, B.
1976 *Criterion Based Reference Testing for Evaluation and Selection of Instructional Materials*
Salt Lake City: Utah State Board of Education.

Wood, D.
1981 'Social studies textbooks in a multicultural society'
History and Social Studies Teacher, 17: 1, 21-29.

AUTHOR INDEX

Ambert, A. N., 9
Andersson, T., 9
Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs, 13, 14
Australian Schools Catalogue Information Service, 113-114

Banks, H. A., 68
Banks, J. A., 9
Blanco, G. C., 10
Blaunstein, P., 2, 4
Bloom, B. S., 76
Boyer, M., 9
Brady, L., 76, 77
Burke, P., 92-93

California State Department of Education, 79
Charuhas, M. S., 64, 82, 85, 87
Christensen, J., 92-93
Committee appointed by the Board of Advanced Education, 97
Committee of Inquiry in Teacher Education, 97
Committee of the Victorian Enquiry into Teacher Education, 97
Committee to examine Teacher Education in New South Wales, 97
Commonwealth Schools Commission, 13, 14
Cordasco, F., 9
Curriculum Development Centre, 112, 114

Davis, T. E., 34, 37
De Luca, J., 61, 82, 85, 93
Department of Education, 13
Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Bicultural Education, 9
Duke, C. R., 2-3

Eash, M. J., 40
Eberhardt, N. A., 72, 85, 86-87, 93
Education Department of South Australia, 113
Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, 41, 42, 43, 46, 51, 52, 87, 101
Elliott, D. L., 40-42
Englehart, M. D., 76
Eraut, M., 32, 35, 40, 54, 57, 58, 90, 91, 105

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 70, 82, 85, 86
Fessler, R., 92-93
Fetsko, W., 35
Furst, E. J., 76

Gibly, B., 76
Gibson, M. A., 9
Goad, L., 32, 35, 40, 54, 57, 58, 90, 91, 105
Gordon, P., 76

Hechinger, F. M., 103
Hernandez, A., 68, 85, 86, 93
Hill, S., 108, 109
Hill, W. H., 76
Hunter, M., 102, 111

Ing, M., 76
Institute for Educational Development, 79

Joyce, B. R., 101, 111

Kamhi, M. M., 79
Klein, M. F., 4
Komoski, P. K., 4, 6, 38, 39, 40, 43, 115
Krathwohl, D. R., 76

Lawton, D., 76
Lloyd, M. V., 72, 85, 86-87, 93

Mackey, W. F., 7
Masia, B. B., 76
Melendez, S. E., 9
Melnick, S. L., 68, 85, 86, 93
Moore, T., 76
Morrissett, I., 34, 35, 36, 37, 103

National Inquiry into Teacher Education, 97
Northern Territory Department of Education, 13

Peters, R. S., 77
Piland, W. E., 60
Popham, W. J., 94
Pratt, D., 78, 79, 81
Pring, R., 76

Rabin, A. T., 68
Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services for Migrants, 13

Saville, M. R., 9
Showers, B., 101, 111
Smith, G., 32, 35, 40, 54, 57, 58, 90, 91, 105
Social Science Education Consortium, 35, 36
South Australian Inquiry into Teacher Education, 97
Stenhouse, L., 76, 77, 78
Stevens, W. W., 34, 35, 36, 37

Taba, H., 76, 78, 79, 82, 84, 90, 91, 93, 94
Talmage, H., 79
The Ohio State University, 62, 82, 85-86, 93
Troike, R. C., 9
Turner, H., 108
Tyler, R. W., 44, 76

Wentling, T. L., 60
Western Australian Educational Computing Consortium, 114
Willis, B., 82, 93
Wood, D., 42
Woodley, C. P., 34, 36, 37

APPENDIX 1: THE NATIONAL NETWORK FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Assessment and Dissemination Center
California State University at Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles
California 90032

Dissemination and Assessment Center
Lesley College (and Fall River Public Schools)
9 Mellon Street
Cambridge
Massachusetts 02138

Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education
Education Service Center Region XIII
Program Development Division
7703 North Lamar Boulevard
Austin
Texas 78752

Arizona Bilingual Materials Development Center
College of Education
Box 609
University of Arizona
Tucson
Arizona 85721

Multilingual-Multicultural Materials Development Center
California State Polytechnic University at Pomona
Office of Teacher Preparation
3801 West Temple Avenue, Building 55
Pomona
California 91768

Spanish Curricula Development Center
7100 North West 17th Avenue
Miami
Florida 33147

Midwest Office for Materials Development
Board of Trustees
University of Illinois
College of Education
805 West Pennsylvania
Urbana
Illinois 61801

Northeast Center for Curriculum Development
I.S. 184, Complex 419
778 Forest Avenue
Bronx
New York 10456

Bilingual Materials Development Center
6000 Camp Bowie Boulevard, Suite 390
Fort Worth
Texas 76107

The National Center for the Development of Bilingual Curriculum
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas
Texas 75204

BABEL Research Center
2168 Shattuck Avenue, 2nd Floor
Berkeley
California 94704

Comprehensive Educational Assistance Center
California State University at Fullerton
800 No. State College Boulevard
Fullerton
California 92634

Cross-Cultural Resource Center
California State University at Sacramento
Department of Anthropolgy
6000 "J" Street
Sacramento
California 95819

Bilingual Education Training Resource Center
Institute of Cultural Pluralism
5544½ Hardy Avenue
San Diego State University
San Diego
California 92182

Midwest Resource Center for Bilingual Bicultural Education
Bilingual Education Service Center
500 South Dwyer Avenue
Arlington Heights
Illinois 60005

New England Bilingual Training Resource Center
Boston University
School of Education
765 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston
Massachusetts 02215

Southwest Bilingual Education Training Center
The University of New Mexico
College of Education
Albuquerque
New Mexico 87131

Regional Bilingual Training Resource Center
City of New York Board of Education
Center for Bilingual Education
131 Livingston Street, Room 224
Brooklyn
New York 11202

Merit Center
Temple University
Riter Hall Annex, Room 995
Broad Street and Columbia Avenue
Philadelphia
Pennsylvania 19122

New England Multilingual-Multicultural Teaching Resource Center
Rhode Island College
Horace Mann Hall
Providence
Rhode Island 02908

South Central Bilingual Resource Center
Education Service Center Region XIII
7703 North Lamar Boulevard
Austin
Texas 78752

Federation of Bilingual Training Resource Centers
PWU Station, Box 23778
Denton
Texas 76204

The Delta Bilingual Bicultural Education Training Resource Center
Education Training Resource Center
309 Milton Bennion Hall
Salt Lake City
Utah 84112

Bilingual Education Technical Assistance Center
708 South G Street
Tacoma
Washington 98405

Bilingual Training Resource Center
406 Hall of Health
G.S. 25
University of Washington
Seattle
Washington 98115

Leonard A. Valverde (ed.), *Bilingual Education for Latinos*, 1978, 109-112. Reprinted with permission of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Copyright (c) 1978 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.

APPENDIX 2: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RESOURCES IN *RESOURCES IN EDUCATION*, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C 20208, U.S A.

1. General

Armstrong, J. R.
1973 *A sourcebook for the evaluation of instructional materials and media*
Arlington: Special Education IMC/RMC Network; Madison: Wisconsin University
ED 107 050

Banathy, B. H. *et al.*
1976 *The analysis and reporting of evaluation training materials developed*
by research and development laboratories and centers. Final report
San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
ED 150 166

Benevento, J.
1984 *Choosing and using textbooks*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Council on the Teaching
of Foreign Languages, Chicago, Illinois, 16-18 November 1984
ED 253 080

Brunelle, R. L. *et al.*
1983 *How can we improve both the quality of textbooks and the process for*
selecting them?
Discussion group paper presented at the National Forum on Excellence in
Education, Indianapolis, Indiana, 6-8 December 1983
ED 247 000

California State Department of Education
1984 *Instructional materials sunset review report. A report to the*
California legislature, as required by senate bill 1155, chapter 1250,
statutes of 1983
Sacramento: California State Department of Education
ED 256 748

Campbell, E. K.
1973 *Content analysis: a tool for choosing texts*
Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
ED 100 964

Carter, Y. (comp.)
1971 *Aids to media selection for students and teachers*
Washington: Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
ED 053 340

Cohen, M. D. (ed.)
1976 *Selecting educational equipment and materials for school and home*
Washington: Association for Childhood Education International
ED 122 455

Cohen, S. and Koehler, N.
1975 *Instructional materials: a bibliography for their selection,*
evaluation and use
New York: City University of New York
ED 140 516

Douma, R. G.
1973 *Book selection policies, book complaint policies and censorship of*

selected Michigan public high schools
Ann Arbor: University of Michigan
ED 078 448

Eash, M. J.
1970 *Developing an instrument for assessment of instructional materials* (Form IV)
New York: City University of New York
ED 041 947

Eash, M. J. *et al.*
1975 *Evaluation of instructional materials* (TM Report 45)
Princeton: Educational Testing Service
ED 117 947

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute *et al.*
1969 *Evaluation practices used in the selection of educational materials and equipment*
New York: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute; Albany: New York State Education Department; Albany: New York State University
ED 038 040

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
1974 *Fits and misfits: what you should know about your child's learning materials*
New York: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute; Columbia: National Committee for Citizens in Education
ED 096 672

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
1976 *Description of selection guidelines, description of guidelines, training materials, and consumer-oriented catalogs to be used in the selection of instructional materials* (Product 4)
New York: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
ED 156 219

Eisner, E. W.
1970 *The evaluation and research of curriculum materials*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March 1970
ED 041 946

Epstein, M. G. *et al.*
1971 *Selection of products for focused dissemination*
Princeton: Educational Testing Service
ED 050 308

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
1976 *Textbook selection and controversy* (The Best of ERIC, Number 16)
Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
ED 119 287

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
1977 *Textbook selection and controversy*
Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
ED 136 358

Florida State Department of Education
1975 *Criteria for instructional materials selection: 1975 adoption*
Tallahassee: Florida State Department of Education
ED 101 753

Folke, C. (comp.)
1980 *A selective bibliography of school materials selection and censorship*
ED 207 568

Freeman, R. E.
1974 *Curriculum materials evaluation as a process for changing education: work of the Diablo Valley Education Project*
Orinda: Diablo Valley Education Project
ED 099 283

George Washington University
1968 *Proceedings of conference for the evaluation of instructional materials*
Washington, D.C., 5-6 April 1968
Washington: George Washington University
ED 027 657

Georgia State Department of Education
1975 *Viewpoints. Instructional materials selection at state and local levels. Suggestions for organization and use*
Atlanta: Georgia State Department of Education
ED 148 398

Griffin, B. N.
1984 A *three-phase procedure for selecting textbooks: less than the best but better than usual*
ED 245 731

Holmes, E. *et al.*
1963 *Policies and procedures for the selection of textbooks in great cities*
Milwaukee: Great Cites Program
ED 001 023

Institute for Educational Development
1969 *Selection of educational materials in the United States public schools*
New York: Institute for Educational Development
ED 044 030

Iowa State Department of Public Instruction
1969 *Guidelines for the evaluation and selection of textbooks and other instructional materials*
Des Moines: Iowa State Department of Public Instruction
ED 070 088

Joint Committee of the National Education Association and Association of American Publishers
1972 *Selecting instructional materials for purchase, procedural guidelines*
Washington: Joint Committee of the National Education Association and Association of American Publishers
ED 058 170

Kamhi, M. M.
1982 *Book and materials selection for school libraries and classrooms: procedures, challenges and responses*
Chicago: American Library Association; Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; Washington: Association of American Publishers
ED 208 885

Kamhi, M. M.
1982 *Book and materials selection for school libraries and classrooms: procedures, challenges and responses*
Chicago: American Library Association; Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; Washington: Association of American Publishers
ED 210 772

Kamhi, M. M.
1982 *Limiting what students shall read, books and other learning materials in our public schools: how they are selected and how they are removed*
Chicago: American Library Association; Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; Washington: Association of American Publishers
ED 210 771

Keith, S.
1981 *Politics of textbook selection*
Berkeley: Stanford University
ED 207 166

Klein, F. M.
1978 *About learning materials*
Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
ED 154 801

Komoski, P. K.
1980 *What curriculum leaders need to know about selecting instructional materials*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Atlanta, Georgia, 29 March-2 April 1980
ED 184 146

Kunder, L. H.
1976 *Procedures for textbook and instructional materials selection. ERS report*
Arlington: Educational Research Service
ED 132 677

Lawson, T. E.
1974 *Formative instructional product evaluation: instruments and strategies*
Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publishers
ED 089 765

McGrew, M. L.
1983 *Survey of the status of materials selection policies in Iowa public school districts in 1983 and comparisons with status in 1979*
Des Moines : Iowa State Department of Public Instruction; Cedar Falls: University of Northern Iowa
ED 242 327

McGuigan, F. J.
1971 *How to select and evaluate programmed instructional materials*
Raleigh: North Carolina State University
ED 051 455

McKeon, H. M.
1975 *Book selection criteria of children's book editors and elementary classroom teachers*
Rutgers: The State University of New Jersey
ED 116 136

Maryland State Department of Education
1981 *Guidelines for the evaluation and selection of instructional materials*
Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education
ED 206 771

Massachusetts State Department of Education
1975 *A guide for the evaluation of instructional materials under chapter 622*
Boston: Massachusetts State Department of Education
ED 159 215

Mehlinger, H. D. and Patrick, J. J.
1970 *The use of 'formative' and 'summative' evaluation in an experimental curriculum project: a case in the practice of instructional materials evaluation*
Bloomington: Indiana University
ED 041 443

Moses, K. J. and Watt, L. B. (comps.)
1976 *Aids to media selection for students and teachers (revised)*
Washington: Office of Education
ED 127 631

Naegle, V. J.
1970 *The evaluation of instructional materials. Bibliography*
Washington: Mid-Atlantic Region Special Education Instructional Materials Center
ED 044 447

Ohio State Department of Education
1983 *Materials selection guidelines* (Minimum Standards Implementation Series)
Columbus: Ohio State Department of Education
ED 252 937

Orlich, D. C. (ed.)
1979 *They still use textbooks --- don't they? Selection and criteria for evaluation*
Olympia: School Information and Research Service
ED 158 702

Perkins, F. L.
1972 *Book and non-book media: annotated guide to selection aids for educational materials*
Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English
ED 064 264

Perkins, F. L.
1972 *Book and non-book media: annotated guide to selection aids for educational materials*
Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English
ED 081 008

Perkins, R.
1967 *Book selection media, a descriptive guide to 170 aids for selecting library materials*
Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English
ED 017 506

Piper, R. W. (comp.)
1982 *Instructional materials selection criteria recommended for use by all school personnel responsible for the selection of instructional materials; selection of instructional materials for use in schools; selected aids for schools: an annotated bibliography for selection of instructional materials*
Winnipeg: Manitoba Department of Education
ED 224 472

Schmidt, M.
1981 *Textbook selection criteria, handbook II*
Washington: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction;
Olympia: Division of Instructional and Professional Services
ED 252 956

Singh, S. P. and Barnard, J.
1969 *Evaluation of instructional materials --- an approach; position paper*
Tampa: University of South Florida
ED 038 812

Swisher, G. (ed.)
1968 *Evaluation: processes and practices, selected papers from the Conference for the Evaluation of Instructional Materials (Washington, D.C., April 5-6 1968)*
Washington: Mid-Atlantic Region Special Education Instructional Materials Center
ED 036 913

Sword, J.
1982 *The what and how of book selection: research findings*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English spring conference, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 15-17 April 1982
ED 235 506

Talmage, H. and Walberg, H. T.
1977 *An evaluation research model for system-wide textbook selection*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York, 4-8 April 1977
ED 138 637

The Ohio State University
1976 *Standard criteria for the selection and evaluation of instructional material. Teacher level*
Columbus: The Ohio State University
ED 132 760

Tierney, R. J. *et al.*
1980 *Some classroom applications of text analysis toward improving text selection and use* (Reading Education Report Number 17)
Cambridge: Bolt, Beranek and Newman; Urbana: Illinois University
ED 192 251

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
1978 *Design, development and evaluation of low-cost educational materials. Report of a regional workshop*
Bangkok: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
ED 197 718

Walton, W. W. *et al.*
1973 *Selection of exemplary educational products. Panel review of products, 1972-1973*
Princeton: Educational Testing Service
ED 083 291

Walton, W. W.
1973 *Dissemination recommendations on and descriptions of exemplary products. Panel review of products (PROP), 1972-1973*
Princeton: Educational Testing Service
ED 083 292

Washburn, J. M.
1978 *The evaluation process*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Kansas City, Missouri, 23-25 November 1978
ED 169 543

Webster, W. J.
1976 *The evaluation of instructional materials*
Syracuse: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources
ED 131 861

Welch, W. W.
1978 *Goal-free formative evaluation: an example*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, 27-31 March 1978
ED 173 350

Willis, B.
1976 *Criterion based reference testing for evaluation and selection of instructional materials*
Salt Lake City: Utah State Board of Education
ED 125 654

Woodbury, M.
1978 *Selecting instructional materials* (Fastback 110)
Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Education Foundation
ED 153 344

Zenke, L. L.
1981 *School book selection: procedures, challenges and responses*
Paper presented to the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Boston, Massachusetts, 20-25 November 1981
ED 213 022

2. Teacher Education

Banks, H. A.
1974 *Evaluation of an instructional program in training teachers to analyze educational materials for possible racial bias*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 1974
ED 090 307

Charuhas, M. S.
1984 *A closer look at books. A self instructive guide to selecting and evaluating materials*
DeKalb: Northern Illinois University; Chicago: Region I Adult Education Service Center
ED 256 913

De Luca, J.
1975 *Material selection B-1 evaluating and selecting learning materials*
(Document Number 10d, revised. Independent Study Training Material for Professional Supervisory Competencies)
Austin: Texas Education Agency
ED 120 986

Eberhardt, N. A. and Lloyd, M. V.
1975 *The assessment of print materials: individualized inservice packet number 1* (Teaching Teen Reading Series)
Columbus :Ohio State Department of Education
ED 106 753

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
1980 *Selecting children's books with multicultural perspective*
San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
ED 177 048

Hernandez, A. and Melnick, S. L.
n.d. *Modular sequence: English as a second language, methods and techniques. TTP001.13. Evaluating and adapting materials*
West Hartford: Hartford University
ED 095 141

National Education Association
1978 *Analyzing children's books from a Chicano perspective. Description of teacher inservice education materials. Summary information*
Washington: National Education Association
ED 169 010

Rabin, A. T.
1978 *A comparison of two methods of in-service programming for helping content area teachers select and use student reading materials*
Report based on Ed.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania
ED 172 163

The Ohio State University
1977 *Professional teacher education module series: select student instructional materials* (Module B-5 of Category B --- Instructional Planning)
Columbus: The Ohio State University
ED 149 063

Wentling, T. L. and Piland, W. E.
1982 *Evaluating instructional materials* (Local Leader Guide IX. Locally-directed Evaluation Handbook)
Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education
ED 225 025

3. Bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education, and related areas

Alabama University and Mobile County Public Schools
1976 *Direction for Alabama reading teachers #1: commercial materials for Title I reading teachers, second edition*
Birmingham: Alabama University; Mobile: Mobile County Public Schools
ED 253 861

Antell, L.
1981 *Indian education: guidelines for evaluating textbooks from an American Indian perspective*
Denver: Education Commission of the States
ED 209 051

Arizona State Department of Education
1974 *What every child should know ... social studies course of study, criteria for textbook selection*
Phoenix: Arizona State Department of Education
ED 141 211

Arizona State Department of Education
1974 *What every child should know ... United States and Arizona history course of study, criteria for textbook selection*
Phoenix: Arizona State Department of Education
ED 141 212

Bennett, C. T. *et al.*
1980 *A conceptual framework for selecting and evaluating multicultural educational materials* (ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series, Number 17)
New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
ED 194 684

Blackburn, G.
1974 *A checklist for selecting elementary social studies materials*
Roseville: Social Studies Service Center
ED 090 132

Breiter, J. and Meune, J.
1974 *A procedure for textbook evaluation illustrated by an analysis of fifth-grade social studies texts*
ED 132 130

Britton, G. and Lumpkin, M.
1977 *A consumer's guide to sex, race and career bias in public school textbooks*
Corvallis: Britton and Associates
ED 162 352

California State Department of Education
1981 *Interim guidelines for evaluation of instructional materials with respect to social content*
Sacramento: California State Department of Education
ED 206 715

California State Department of Education
1982 *Standards for evaluation of instructional materials with respect to social content*
Sacramento: California State Department of Education
ED 230 471

Chapman. H. C.
1975 *Selecting short stories for early stages of language learning*
Paper presented at the Southern Conference on Language Teaching, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1975
ED 139 249

Cotera, M. P. (comp.)
1982 *Checklists for counteracting race and sex bias in educational materials*
Newton: Education Development Center
ED 221 612

Council on Interracial Books for Children
1979 *Guidelines for selecting bias-free textbooks and storybooks*
New York: Council for Interracial Books for Children
ED 199 352

Crawley, S. J.
1977 *SOB: selection of basals*
First published in the *New England Reading Association Journal*, 12: 2, (1977)
ED 155 588

Darling, S. *et al.*
1983 *Guide to selection of adult literacy materials. Analyze before you buy*
Louisville: Jefferson County Public Schools
ED 235 321

De Leon, J.
1983 *Evaluating and adapting materials for use with bilingual exceptional children*
Paper presented at the annual international convention of The Council for Exceptional Children, Detroit, Michigan, 4-8 April 1983
ED 230 007

Dee, R.
1980 *Planning for ethnic education: a handbook for planned change (revised edition)*
Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education
ED 191 976

Deya, L. L.
1975 *A bilingual librarian looks at book selection for children and young adults*
Atlanta: Southern Conference on Language Teaching
ED 139 247

Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education
1977 *Cartel: annotations and analyses of bilingual multicultural materials.* (Winter 1976-77, Volume IV, Number 2)
Austin: Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education
ED 140 613

Dusel, J.
1970 *Criteria for selection of materials for foreign language, kindergarten and grades one through eight*
Sacramento: Foreign Language Association of Greater Sacramento, California
ED 039 799

Eash, M.
1969 *Evaluation of instructional materials for exceptional children and youth: a preliminary instrument*
New York: City University of New York
ED 040 540

Eastern Pennsylvania Regional Resources Center for Special Education
1977 *Individualized materials for the handicapped: a guide for selection*
King of Prussia: Eastern Pennsylvania Regional Resources Center for Special Education
ED 148 048

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
1975 *EPIE career-education S*E*T*. Volume 1: how to select and evaluate instructional materials *** selection and evaluation tools*
New York: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
ED 126 360

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
1976 *Selector's guide for bilingual education materials, volume 1*
(EPIE Report: Number 73)
New York: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
ED 217 705

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
1976 *Selector's guide for bilingual education materials, volume 2*
(EPIE Report: Number 74)
New York: Educational Products Information Exchange Institute
ED 217 708

Fox, T. E.
1972 *Using evaluative assertion analysis for social studies research*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Boston, Massachusetts, November 1972
ED 073 963

Garcia, J.
1978 *Evaluating multiethnic materials*
ED 162 945

Garcia, J. and Armstrong, D. G.
1978 *A simple procedure for evaluating textbooks for their treatment of selected groups that minimizes inter-rater variability*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C., 4-8 March 1978
ED 163 466

Greenlaw, M. J. *et al.*
1973 *A study of the influence of advertising techniques on selection of instructional reading materials by prospective teachers*
Paper presented at the 1973 National Reading Conference
ED 127 550

Haas, M. E.
1985 *Evaluating sponsored materials: how to do it in the social studies classroom* (Series 4, Number 3)
Washington: National Council for the Social Studies
ED 258 882

Hahn, C. L.
1978 *The adoption of new social studies textbooks in Georgia: a case study of innovation diffusion*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, 27-31 March 1978
ED 156 567

Haley, F. (ed.)
1982 *Guide to selected ethnic heritage materials*
Boulder: Social Science Education Consortium
ED 216 949

Harrison, D.
1979 *Adult basic education materials evaluation*
Guide prepared at the University of Arizona
ED 173 768

Illinois State Board of Education
1981 *A guide for evaluating and selecting multicultural instructional materials*
Springfield: Illinois State Board of Education
ED 192 956

Illinois State Office of Education
1975 *Guidelines for the evaluation and selection of ethnically valid instructional materials*
Chicago: Illinois State Office of Education
ED 150 237

Indiana State Department of Public Instruction
1974 *TIME (Teacher Initiated Materials Evaluation) project report. An aid in the selection of special education materials*
Indianapolis: Indiana State Department of Public Instruction
ED 143 190

Indiana State Department of Public Instruction
1977 *Criteria for evaluating instructional materials. Reading effectiveness program*
Indianapolis: Indiana State Department of Public Instruction
ED 201 985

Johnson, C. H.
1979 *Choosing materials that do the job* (The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series, Volume 10)
New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
ED 180 214

Knight, M. M. and Hodges, J. O.
1970 *Curriculum materials analysis system: a summary of experience*
Boulder: Social Science Education Consortium
ED 041 794

Knight, M. M. *et al.*
1971 *Curriculum materials analysis system, long form, revised edition*
Boulder: Social Science Education Consortium
ED 252 474

Knight, M. M. *et al.*
1971 *Curriculum materials analysis system, short form, revised edition*
Boulder: Social Science Education Consortium
ED 252 475

Latimer, B. I. (ed.) *et al.*
1972 *Starting out right: how to choose books about black people for young children*
Madison: Madison Equal Opportunity Commission
ED 065 656

Levine, J. S.
1969 *Empirical study of instructional materials evaluation in special education* (Monograph Series Number 3)
East Lansing: Michigan State University
ED 031 849

McCullough, C. M.
1965 *Preparation of textbooks in the mother tongue. A guide for those who write and those who evaluate textbooks in any language*
New Delhi: National Institute of Education
ED 011 826

McGarey, D. G. *et al.*
1964 *The treatment of minorities, guidelines for textbook selection*
Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction
ED 001 923

Magisos, J. H.
1973 *A model for acquisition and selection of career instructional materials. Final report*
Newton: New England Resource Center; Columbus: The Ohio State University
ED 098 385

Maryland State Department of Education
1973 *Bibliography of the sources for the evaluation and selection of instructional materials which ensure the proper recognition of ethnic and cultural minorities*
Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education
ED 095 885

Mullins, J. B.
1978 *Be aware of stereotypes and bias when developing and evaluating curricular materials*
ED 211 995

Nadler, H.
1969 *Criteria for the selection of ESOL materials*
Paper presented at the Third Annual TESOL Conference, Chicago, Illinois, 5-8 March 1969
ED 030 880

National Council of Teachers of English
1970 *Criteria for teaching materials in reading and literature*
Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English
ED 061 222

National Education Association
1973 *Checklist for selecting and evaluating U.S. history textbooks*
Washington: National Education Association
ED 097 241

Newman, J. A.
1977 *Guidelines for identifying and counteracting bias in instructional materials grades K-12*
Washington: Olympia School District
ED 155 233

New Mexico State Department of Education
1973 *Guidelines for the evaluation and selection of textbooks in the treatment of minorities (especially in social studies)*
Santa Fe: New Mexico State Department of Education
ED 084 171

Olsen, H. C.
1967 *Criteria for selecting materials to teach reading*
ED 012 231

Olsen, H. C.
1968 *Linguistic principles and the selection of materials*
Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, 24-27 April 1968
ED 022 649

Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company
1974 *A systematic approach to evaluating career education materials at the local level*
Washington: Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Co.
ED 109 381

Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction
1967 *The treatment of minorities: guidelines for textbook selection*
Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction
ED 024 727

Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey
1976 *Evaluation echoes: a teacher's guide for selecting bilingual education materials*
Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education
ED 143 172

Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey
1976 *Manual for the evaluation of instructional materials and curriculum guides for bilingual education programs. Facilitator's edition*
Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education
ED 143 739

Purcel, J. M.
1983 *Choosing foreign language literature in the high school: a checklist*
In: *Speak out and touch someone* (The OMLTA Yearbook, 1983)
ED 230 053

Racism and Sexism Resource Center for Educators
1980 *10 quick ways to analyze children's books for racism and sexism*
New York: Racism and Sexism Resource Center for Educators
ED 188 852

Reynolds, A. B.
1981 *A proposed design for a vocational instructional materials evaluation*
Clemson: South Carolina Vocational Education Research Coordinating Unit
ED 222 732

Schmidt, N. J.
1975 *Evaluating materials about Africa for children*
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Illinois Association of School Librarians, Springfield, Illinois, April 1975
ED 107 262

Schoen, F. E. and Childs, J. W.
1981 *Formative evaluation of instructional products: is it worth it?*
ED 254 536

Simpson, E. L. and Loveall, P. W.
1976 *Preparing and selecting printed educational materials for adult new readers* (Information Series Number 9)
DeKalb: Northern Illinois University; Columbus: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career and Vocational Education
ED 132 244

Suh, B. K.
1970 *Quantitative and qualitative evaluation of social studies textbook content*
ED 084 180

Sword, J.
1980 *Criteria for evaluating picture story books*
ED 236 658

Tom, A.
1977 *An approach to selecting among social studies curricula. Revised edition*
St. Louis: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory
ED 152 605

Ventura, M. F.
1983 *The development of a weighted checklist prototype for instructional materials selection for special education students. Final report*
University of Kansas
ED 244 501

Ward, T.
1969 *Evaluation of instructional materials. Position paper*
East Lansing: Michigan State University
ED 078 610

Watt, M.
1984 *A guide for selecting bilingual bicultural resource materials, volume 1*
Hobart: University of Tasmania
ED 253 557

Watt, M. and De Jong, M.
1984 *A guide for selecting bilingual bicultural resource materials, volume 2*
Hobart: University of Tasmania
ED 253 558

Watt, M.
1984 *A guide for selecting bilingual bicultural resource materials, volume 3*
Hobart: University of Tasmania
ED 253 559

Whipple, G.
1968 *Practical problems of schoolbook selection for disadvantaged youth*
Paper presented at the International Reading Association conference, Boston, Massachusetts, 24-27 April 1968
ED 029 750

Wilcox, L. M.
1971 *Choosing literature for young children*
Los Angeles: University of Southern California
ED 071 022

Witter, J. (ed.)
1977 *Bias in the textbooks: a symposium*
Salem: Oregon Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
ED 147 852

Williams, B. *et al.*
1976 *Manual for evaluating content of classroom instructional materials for bilingual-multicultural education*
San Diego: San Diego State University
ED 160 276

Williams, C. T.
1975 *Criteria for analyzing ethnic bias in instructional materials*
East Lansing: Michigan Education Association
ED 118 662

Women on Words and Images
1979 *A checklist for evaluating materials*
Princeton: Women on Words and Images
ED 193 234

Wright, I. and Williams, D.
1977 *An analysis of selected curriculum materials in values/moral education*
Vancouver: British Columbia University
ED 143 569

Yearwood, D. G. and Yearwood, E. I.
1979 *Selectability of print materials in support of the grades 10 and 11 social studies curriculum*
Vancouver: Educational Research Institute of British Columbia
ED 180 926

APPENDIX 3: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RESOURCES IN *CURRENT INDEX TO JOURNALS IN EDUCATION*

Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), U.S. Department of Education,
Washington, D.C. 20208, U.S.A.

1. General

1.1 Methodologies

American Library Association
1982 Developing a selection policy
Principal, 61: 3, 15
EJ 257 878

Armstrong, D. G. and Shutes, R. E.
1981 Quality in curriculum documents: some basic criteria
Educational Leadership, 39: 3, 200-202
EJ 256 408

Carr, V. H. and Datiles, U. P. (eds.)
1980 Systematic assessment and appraisal of instructional materials
Technological Horizons in Education, 7: 1, 51-52
EJ 228 661

Cassie, J. R. B. and Styles, K. H.
1981 Reviewing and selecting books and learning materials for school use: a helpful set of criteria and a list of necessary steps
Education Canada, 21: 3, 12-15
EJ 254 184

Caulley, D. and Douglas, M.
1985 Evaluating instructional film or video: suggestions for feedback before the final point
Educational Technology, 25: 6, 29-33
EJ 318 775

Criscuolo, N. P.
1984 These two tools make light work of tough purchasing decisions
American School Board Journal, 171: 8, 25
EJ 302 781

Crumbly, J. W. and Copeland, A.
1983 Suggested criteria for the selection of textbooks
Business Education Forum, 37: 5, 24-25
EJ 273 921

Diamond, E. E.
1985 Development of the Joint Committee standards for evaluations of educational programs, projects, and materials
Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 18: 2, 51-57
EJ 320 823

Gow, D. T.
1980 Intrinsic analysis of instructional materials: an aid to site-specific tailoring of instruction
Educational Technology, 20: 5, 7-15
EJ 228 292

Grosskopf, D.
1981 Textbook evaluation and selection in the curriculum
Nurse Educator, 6: 6, 32-35
EJ 251 925

Hallenbeck, M.
1980 How to serve successfully on a textbook selection committee
American School Board Journal, 167: 8, 21-24
EJ 230 081

Hallenbeck, M. and Hood, S.
1981 Textbook selection: how to get what you want
Instructor, 91: 3, 110-112
EJ 250 730

Harber, J. R.
1981 The importance of evaluating the syntactic complexity of instructional material
Reading Horizons, 21: 4, 280-289
EJ 257 776

IRA Committee on Nonprint Media and Reading
1984 Criteria for selection and use of nonprint media
Journal of Reading, 28: 3, 266-267
EJ 306 573

Kachaturoff, G.
1982 Textbook evaluation and selection: a professional responsibility
Social Studies, 73: 1, 32-36
EJ 260 533

Kandaswamy, S.
1980 Sequential model for appraising instructional superiority of a revised material
Journal of Theory, Research and Development, 28: 3, 186-193
EJ 232 698

Kirst, M. W.
1984 Choosing textbooks: reflections of a state board president
American Educator: The Professional Journal of the American Federation of Teachers, 8: 2, 18-23
EJ 305 018

Leiblum, M. D.
1980 A media selection model geared toward CAL
Technological Horizons in Education, 7: 2, 29-33
EJ 220 126

Manning, M. L. and Boals, B.
1981 Free and inexpensive material: guidelines for appropriate selection
Clearing House, 55: 3, 111-112
EJ 253 202

Meyer, J. K. and Barber, R. W.
1978 The media supervisor and the selection process
Drexel Library Quarterly, 14: 3, 45-64
EJ 209 768

Mischio, G. S. and Franks, D. J.
1982 The development and application of an instructional materials evaluation system: preacademic level
Journal of Special Education Technology, 5: 2, 5-14
EJ 285 506

Muther, C.
1984 The skills trace
Educational Leadership, 42: 3, 82-85
EJ 310 036

Muther, C.
1984-1985 How to evaluate a basal textbook: the skills trace
Educational Leadership, 42: 4, 79-80
EJ 311 604

Muther, C.
1985 Alternatives to piloting textbooks
Educational Leadership, 42: 6, 79-83
EJ 315 267

Muther, C.
1985 What every textbook evaluator should know
Educational Leadership, 42: 7, 4-8
EJ 319 791

Redei, G. P.
1984 What to look for in selecting college textbooks
Journal of College Science Teaching, 14: 2, 103-105
EJ 308 956

Sanacore, J.
1982 Selecting controversial issues: bringing the forces together
Journal of Reading, 25: 6, 506-511
EJ 259 280

Talmage, H.
1981 Selecting instructional materials: part I. The antecedents of selection
Curriculum Review, 20: 1, 9-13
EJ 237 962

Talmage, H.
1981 Selecting instructional materials: part II. Matching materials to needs
Curriculum Review, 20: 2, 105-109
EJ 241 804

Talmage, H.
1981 Selecting instructional materials: part III. Supplementing the basal program
Curriculum Review, 20: 3, 213-218
EJ 246 574

Thypin, M.
1979 Selection of books of high interest and low reading level
Journal of Learning Disabilities, 12: 6, 428-430
EJ 208 208

Warming, E. O. and Baker, E. C.
1980 Touchstones for textbook selection
Phi Delta Kappan, 61: 10, 694-695
EJ 225 467

Williams, D.
1983 Developing criteria for textbook evaluation
ELT Journal, 37: 3, 251-261
EJ 282 836

Wright, I.
1983 The politics of curriculum materials selection: the British Columbia case
History and the Social Science Teacher, 18: 4, 211-218
EJ 283 228

Zenke, L. and LaPota, M.
1983 School book selection: procedures, challenges, and responses
English Journal, 72: 4, 36-38
EJ 277 880

1.2 Studies

Atkins, C. P. and Carline, J. L.
1980 Reading materials in public schools: selection and controversy
Contemporary Education, 51: 4, 182-185
EJ 235 446

Cambre, M. A.
1981 Historical overview of formative evaluation of instructional media products
Educational Communication and Technology: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Development, 29: 1, 3-25
EJ 246 044

Kamhi, M. M.
1982 Censorship vs. selection: choosing books for schools
American Education, 18: 2, 11-16
EJ 262 771

Kandaswamy, S.
1980 Evaluation of instructional materials: a synthesis of models and methods
Educational Technology, 20: 6, 9-26
EJ 228 324

Parker, B.
1981 Disparate ways of selecting texts
Executive Educator, 3: 12, 27,34
EJ 255 055

2. Teacher education
2.1 Studies

Marsh, C. J.
1983 Curriculum materials analysis in social studies methods classes
Social Studies, 74: 3, 107-111
EJ 284 693

3. Bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education, and related areas
3.1 Methodologies

Acosta-Belen, E. and Sjostrom, B. R.
1979 Aula/the classroom: guidelines for the evaluation of instructional materials for sexism and racism
NABE: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 4: 1, 81-91
EJ 218 348

Asman, D.
1983 The hidden agenda
American Educator: The Professional Journal of the American Federation of Teachers, 7: 1, 16-19
EJ 278 967

Bennett, C. T. et al.
1984 A conceptual framework for selecting and evaluating multicultural educational materials
Journal of Social Studies Research, 8: 2, 39-52
EJ 316 041

Bertoletti, M. C. and Dahlet, P.
1984 Manuels et materiels scolaires pour l'apprentissage du F.L.E. Ebauche d'une grille d'analyse (Study guides and instructional materials for learning French as a foreign language. Outline of a grid for analysis)
Francais dans le Monde, 186, 55-63
EJ 302 920

Breiter, J.
1981 Evaluating materials for gifted education: opportunity knocks
G/C/T, 16, 26-29
EJ 240 553

Breiter, J.
1982 Evaluating classroom materials for gifted children
Roeper Review, 5: 1, 17-18
EJ 274 485

Brimble, R. A.
1981 A guide to selecting reading materials
Australian Journal of Reading, 4: 4, 173-178
EJ 259 307

Carter, D. A.
1983 Selecting resources for the multicultural classroom
Momentum, 14: 1, 47-49
EJ 287 047

Cheek, D. H.
1983 ERIC/RCS: secondary reading materials: selection criteria for the classroom teacher
Journal of Reading, 26: 8, 734-736
EJ 279 359

Cohen, S. B. et al.
1979 Selecting and developing educational materials: an inquiry model
Teaching Exceptional Children, 12: 1, 7-11
EJ 214 329

Gilles, J.
1980 Preferred picks: materials for classroom teachers with special students
Pointer, 24: 3, 82-87
EJ 234 280

Hicks, D.
1981 Teaching about other peoples: how biased are school books?
Education 3-13, 9: 2, 14-19
EJ 253 264

International Reading Association
1981 Checklist for evaluating adult basic education reading material
Journal of Reading, 24: 8, 701-706
EJ 245 627

Josel, N. A.
1982 Public library material selection in a bilingual community
Catholic Library World, 54: 3, 113-115
EJ 273 015

Moffet, J. B.
1982 Student interest and pertinence of content in selecting reading materials
Reading Improvement, 19: 4, 310-312
EJ 271 071

Pennington, C. R.
1984 Evaluating books for the gifted reader
G/C/T, 34, 15-18
EJ 306 835

Rice, G. and Rice, G. H.
1982 A selection guide for elementary social studies textbooks
Social Studies, 73: 2, 61-67
EJ 262 496

Roberts, A. D.
1980 The Roberts' checklist: selecting and evaluating social studies material
Social Studies, 71: 3, 114-117
EJ 226 490

Rothe, J. P.
1982 Helping teachers analyze basic structures in social studies program materials
History and Social Science Teacher, 17: 3, 147-153
EJ 260 556

Sciarone, A. G.
1979-1980 Valutazione del libri di testo per le lingue strannere (Italiano L2) (Evaluation of foreign language textbooks (Italian as a second language))
Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata, 11: 3/12: 1, 145-172
EJ 232 323

Singer, M. G. and Pass, B. H.
1982 Beyond advertising: how to choose materials for review and purchase
Academic Therapy, 17: 3, 323-327
EJ 259 588

Stieglitz, E. L.
1982 A rating scale for evaluating English as a second language reading material
Journal of Reading, 26: 3, 222-228
EJ 271 134

Turner, T. N.
1981 Values questions and selecting reading materials
Tennessee Education, 11: 2, 18-20
EJ 260 239

Wood, D.
1981 Social studies textbooks in a multicultural society
History and the Social Science Teacher, 17: 1, 21-29
EJ 262 461

3.2 Studies

Bindel, H. J.
1983 Bilingual/multicultural science resources
NABE: *The Journal for the National Association for Bilingual Education*, 8: 1, 23-28
EJ 307 287

Brimble, R. A.
1981 Who selects reading materials?
Australian Journal of Reading, 4: 4, 199-202
EJ 259 310

Butterfield, R. A.
1979 Multicultural analysis of a popular basal reading series in the International Year of the Child
Journal of Negro Education, 48: 3, 382-389
EJ 210 332

Garcia, J.
1980 Toward more effective methods of evaluating ethnic content in curricular materials
Illinois School Research and Development, 16: 2, 41-48
EJ 226 944

Gonzales, P. C.
1983 An analysis of language development materials
NABE: The Journal for the National Association for Bilingual Education,
8: 1, 5-21
EJ 307 286

Grant, C. A. and Grant, W. A.
1981 The multicultural evaluation of some second and third grade textbook readers: a survey analysis
Journal of Negro Education, 50: 1, 63-74
EJ 241 624

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
1980 Selecting bias-free texts
Today's Education, 69: 3, 86-87
EJ 237 781

Wiedrick, L. G.
1979 Sources for selecting Canadian elementary school materials
Elements: Translating Theory into Practice, 11: 2, 4-6
EJ 213 635

APPENDIX 4: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF JOURNAL ARTICLES IN THE *BRITISH EDUCATION INDEX*

British Library Bibliographic Services Division, London, England

1. General

1.1 Methodologies

Blanchard, B. E.
1983 The Illinois Index for selecting textbooks
Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis, 20: 2, 161-175
20, 351

Oldham, B. E.
1981 Selection: the greatest responsibility
School Librarian, 29: 1, 6-11
17,266

Williams, D.
1983 Developing criteria for textbook evaluation
English Language Teaching Journal, 37: 3, 251-255
20, 350

1.2 Studies

Mariet, F.
1980 The social conditions for a selection of instructional audio-visual media
European Journal of Education, 15: 3, 241-249
17, 24

2. Bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education, and related areas

2.1 Methodologies

Davey, M.
1982 Choosing and using oral materials
Journal, Association of Teachers of Italian, 37, 43-46
19, 347

De Rome, D.
1982 The selection and use of authentic written material for adults
Journal, Association of Teachers of Italian, 57, 22-31
19, 347

Fenwick, G.
1981 Finding out about children's literature
Links, 7: 1, 28-31
18

Hicks, D.
1981 Teaching about other people: how biased are school books?
Education 3-13, 9: 2, 14-19
18, 323

Maingay, S. M.
1980 Selection and grading of authentic material for the reading class
English Language Teaching Journal, 34: 3, 217-221
17, 266

Raddan, A.
1984 Selecting non-fiction books for a multi-ethnic society
School Librarian, 32: 1, 20-24
21

Sandford, H. A.
1983 Criteria for selecting a school atlas
Teaching Geography, 8: 3, 107-109
19, 346

Wilson, J.
1982 Choosing information books
Signal, 39, 163-168
20

2.2 Studies

Marsh, C. J.
1985 Teachers' perceptions about the selection, distribution and use of social studies and mathematics curriculum materials within a state education system
Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17: 1, 49-61

APPENDIX 5: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF NONJOURNAL WORKS IN THE *AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION INDEX*, The Australian Council for Educational Research, Hawthorn, Victoria 3122, Australia

1. General

Franzel, A.
1982 Selecting books
In: Noel, E. (ed.), *Able to enjoy: books and the young*, 85-93
Sydney : IBBY Australia
25: 3128

Hill, S.
1983 Who selects the books? A discussion and case study of a literature program in a primary school
In: Hutchins, J. *et al.*(eds.), *Shaping the curriculum*, 1, 17.1-17.10
Adelaide: South Australian College of Advanced Education
Preconference paper, National Curriculum Conference
28: 1686

McKerlie, D.
1979 *Establishment of a media information and evaluation system*
Sydney: Department of Technical and Further Education, New South Wales
23: 1360

Marsh, C. J. *et al.*
1981 *Selection and distribution of curriculum materials*
Perth: Education Department of Western Australia
24: 1228

2. Bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education, and related areas

Seddon, T.
1983 The politics of content selection: the case of Japanese history textbooks
In: Hutchins J. *et al.* (eds.), *Shaping the curriculum*, 1, 18.1-18.4
Adelaide: South Australian College of Advanced Education
Preconference paper, National Curriculum Conference
12: 1750

Watt, M.
1984 A *guide for selecting bilingual bicultural resource materials, volume 1*
Hobart: University of Tasmania
28: 1785

Watt, M.
1984 A *guide for selecting bilingual bicultural resource materials, volume 2*
Hobart: University of Tasmania
28: 1786

Watt, M. and De Jong, M.
1984 A *guide for selecting bilingual bicultural resource materials, volume 3*
Hobart: University of Tasmania
28: 1787

APPENDIX 6: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF JOURNAL ARTICLES IN *AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION INDEX*

The Australian Council for Educational Research, Hawthorn, Victoria 3122, Australia

1 General

1.1 Methodologies

Chan, K. P.
1983 Evaluating a textbook to suit our local environment
Education Library Service Bulletin, 21: 2, 21-24
26: 3190

Crewe, J.
1981 Selecting curriculum materials K-12
Orana, 17: 4, 153-157
25: 1397

Gunter, A.
1979 Choosing and organising learning materials
Study of Society, 10: 2, 4-5
23: 1329

Gunter, A.
1979 Mixed ability classes: choosing and organising learning materials
Australian Journal of Remedial Education, 11: 3, 18-26
23: 1330

Gunter, A.
1983 Guidelines for choosing books and course materials
English in Australia, 65, 3-8
27: 1467

Krister, L.
1984 Evaluating instructional packages
Australian Journal of Adult Education, 24: 1, 11-17
28: 1876

Marsh, C.
1983 Primary school principals: intentions and realities in the selection of curriculum materials
Australian Administrator, 4: 3, 1-4
27: 1505

Vancouver School Board. Board of School Trustees of School District 39
1984 Selection of learning resources: a policy statement
Journal of the School Library Association of Queensland, 16: 3, 15-18
28: 3938

1.2 Studies

Langrehr, J.
1983 Case studies: how do you select curriculum materials?
Curriculum Perspectives, 3: 1, 31-36
27: 1492

2 Teacher education
2.1 Studies

Gough, N.
1983 Curriculum development and teacher development in a materials evaluation project
Curriculum Perspectives, 3: 1, 37-43
27: 1634

3 Bilingual-bicultural and multicultural education, and related areas
3.1 Methodologies

Borthwick, J.
1982 The selection of textbooks: source books and course books for the English classroom
English in Australia, 61, 3-21
27: 1427

Brimble, R. A.
1981 A guide to selecting reading materials
Australian Journal of Reading, 4: 4, 173-178
25: 1620

Comber, B.
1981 Self selecting and reading with purpose
Reading Around, 9: 4, 91-94
25: 1640

Davey, G.
1979 Non-English literature and folklore for young children: some problems in selection of material
Australian Journal of Early Childhood, 4: 4, 9-12
23: 1540

Hyland, L.
1979 Selecting fiction books for aboriginal children
VAT, 4: 12, 22-23
23: 1340

Hyland, L.
1980 Selecting fiction for aboriginal children
Polycom, 25, 24-27
25: 1427

Smith, J.
1981 Selecting literary texts in the multicultural classroom: some considerations
Teaching of English, 41, 3-13
26: 2264

van Wageningen, B.
1985 Prejudice in writing: analysing texts for bias
Multicultural Education Newsletter, 35, 3-6
28: 1778

3.2 Studies

Brimble, R. A.
1981 Who selects reading materials?
Australian Journal of Reading, 4: 4, 199-202
25: 1621

Lippman, L.
1983 Survey of racial and ethnic bias in primary text books
Wikaru, 12, 107-123
27: 1495

Marsh, C. J. et al.
1985 Teachers' perceptions about selection, distribution and use of social studies and mathematics curriculum materials within a state education system
Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17: 1, 49-61
28: 2599

APPENDIX 7: EXTRACT FROM THE INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO THE SURVEY

It is intended that the content of such a course would include the following aspects:

1. **Rationale:** The purpose of the program is to improve the quality of selection and evaluation of curriculum materials.

2. **Objectives:** The objectives of the program are:

   2.1 to transmit knowledge concerning different types of organizations and methods for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials;

   2.2 to allow participants to experience these processes through conducting actual selections and evaluations of appropriate curriculum materials;

   2.3 to transmit knowledge concerning presently available resources for selecting and evaluating curriculum materials; and

   2.4 to define problems inherent in curriculum materials generally.

3. **Contents:** The contents of the program are not intended to be treated as mutually exclusive segments or sequentially. For convenience, the contents are presented respectively as:

   3.1

      3.1.1 the presentation of knowledge about alternative organizational structures for selecting curriculum materials (ranging from selection by individual selectors to selection by committee either inside or outside the educational context);

      3.1.2 alternative methods for selecting curriculum materials (ranging from use of undefined criteria and standards to appraisal forms applying commonly agreed-upon criteria and standards);

      3.1.3 alternative organizations for evaluating curriculum materials (ranging from individual evaluators, individual evaluators and editors to an evaluation team operating inside or outside the educational context); and

      3.1.4 alternative methods for evaluating curriculum materials (ranging from literary criticism to evaluation instruments based upon explicitly defined or optional curriculum models).

   3.2 provision of scope for participants to experience the ranges of alternatives in organizations and methods through conducting selections and evaluations of curriculum materials, and to form values concerning the appropriateness of each;

3.3 to present knowledge about institutions and publications currently available concerning the selection and evaluation of curriculum materials;
and

3.4 the presentation of knowledge about problems inherent in curriculum materials generally - the characteristics of quality (the lack of comprehensive criteria), the conduct of research in curriculum materials to provide needed answers (the inadequacy of the experimental model of research to adequately investigate the problems of curriculum materials particularly those concerned with imparting values), the incorporation of learner based verification and revision (its applicability to different types of learning materials, compilation of such data including valid and reliable field testing procedures), and the need to define responsibility for learning resulting from curriculum materials.

4. **Methods:** Didactic instruction, discussion and questioning methods would be appropriate for presenting the contents of 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and some aspects of 3.4. Problem-solving, heuristic and discovery methods, role-playing and simulation, and experiential methods would be appropriate for presenting the contents of 3.2 and some aspects of 3.4.

5. **Means of Assessment:** Assessment is designed to be applied in two contexts.

   (i) Assessment within the program: This would involve the development of criterion-referenced instruments such as performance-based checklists for both formative and summative assessment of participants through observation.

   (ii) Assessment within the educational context: Criterion-referenced instruments may also be developed for this purpose, or a clinical supervisory model may be applied.

APPENDIX 8 : THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEY OF COURSE CO-ORDINATORS OF THE CENTRE FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION OF TEACHERS

1. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

1.1 Do you believe it is essential for teachers to possess knowledge and skills about how to select curriculum materials?

yes, strongly agree	4
yes, agree	2
undecided	0
no, disagree	0
no, strongly disagree	0

1.2 Please write below additional comments you wish to make about teachers possessing knowledge and skills to select and evaluate curriculum materials, particularly as this relates to teacher education.

Comment 1: 'I think that as most teachers have to make choices about curriculum materials, it is very important that they have some idea of how to go about it.'

Comment 2: 'I'd agree, and there is some value in making this task to "select and evaluate curriculum materials" a conscious one in all of us as teachers. I doubt the point of view that this task depends upon a single set of principles, and believe each curriculum area should address the task and examine the principles that apply in that area.'

2. CHOICE OF COURSE DESIGN

2.1 Which type of course design do you believe is most appropriate to learners' needs?

an independently operating CCET course	0
a topic incorporated within an existing subject	5
some combination of both the above course designs	1

2.2 Please write below comments you wish to make about options that might be chosen to develop suitable course designs for staff development of teachers.

Comment 1: 'You might wish to discuss with lecturers what they do already. It may lead to your offering advice to them - or it may point out the areas of the curriculum as yet unaddressed in CCET units where such a study as your proposed unit might concentrate its attention.'

Comment 2: 'The CCET Computers in Education course already contains a unit on the evaluation and selection of software and associated materials.'

3. INDEPENDENTLY OPERATING CCET COURSE

How well does the coverage provided within the course outline given in the introductory letter ......

		exc.	good	fair	poor	uncert.	unspec.
3.1	...offer attention to knowledge?	0	3		0	1	2
3.2	...offer attention to skills?	0	0	2	0	2	2
3.3	...offer attention to attitudes and values?	1	0	1	1	1	2
3.4	...suitable for the needs of teachers?	0	0	2	0	1	3

3.5 If you were asked to contribute to development and implementation of this type of course design, to what extent would you support this?

yes, strongly support	1
yes, support	1
undecided	2
no, oppose	1
no, strongly oppose	0
not specified	1

3.6 Please write below additional comments about any aspect for including an independently operating general course in the CCET program.

Comment 1: 'I think that an independently operating general course would just preach to the already converted. As I think a unit on this topic would be valuable for all teachers, I would support a unit in an already existing course.'

Comment 2: 'I think there should be as wide a range of units available to teachers as possible, and they should bear directly on teaching concerns (which this proposed unit does). However I suspect it will become an attempt to create another "field of educational knowledge" isolated by its theoretical concerns from the subject disciplines it is attempting to secure. Choice of materials is best discussed by the maths, reading, social studies etc. people who know their own field and materials.'

Comment 3: 'I am not really convinced of the need for a whole course devoted to this?'

4. TOPIC INCORPORATED WITHIN AN EXISTING SUBJECT

4.1 Do you presently provide a topic about selecting and evaluating curriculum materials within your course?

yes	6
no	0

Within the CCET course for which you are responsible, would ...

	strongly agree	agree	uncertain	disagree	strongly disagree	not applic
4.2 ...you view it to be beneficial to incorporate a topic about selecting and evaluating curriculum materials?	6	0	0	0	0	0
4.3 ...it be feasible to incorporate a topic about selecting and evaluating curriculum materials?	4	0	0	0	0	2
4.4 ...it be beneficial for teachers in your course if such a topic was included?	4	0	0	0	0	2

4.5 If you were asked to contribute to development and implementation of a topic about selecting and evaluating curriculum materials within your course, to what extent would you support this?

yes, strongly support	4
yes, support	0
undecided	0
no, oppose	1
no, strongly oppose	0
not applicable	1

4.6 Please write below additional comments about any aspect of selecting and evaluating curriculum materials within your course.

Comment 1: 'As I already include some seminars on this topic in the course, I would like to see it done "properly". As I have only informal expertise in this area, I too would benefit from knowing how to go about it.'

Comment 2: 'I feel that discussion with you would be the best initial move in any kind of development in selecting and evaluating curriculum materials. We could see where it might be possible to go from there.'

APPENDIX 9: LIST OF COURSES DEVELOPED BY THE CENTRE FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION OF TEACHERS, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA

1. Foundation Studies

Foundations of Teaching I, Foundations of Teaching II, Foundations of Teaching III

2. Advanced Studies

Art in Education, Asian Studies in Education, Bases of Educational Decision, Classroom Strategies in Social Science, Comparative Education, Computers in Education, Drama in Education, Early Childhood Education, English for Secondary Teachers, Educational Media, Environmental Studies in Education, Geography in Education, Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Home Economics in Education, Introduction to the Sociology of Education, Introduction to Special Education, Introductory Studies to Community Education, Language and Education, Language Development and Multicultural Education, Literature for Children, Mathematics and Education, Music and Education, Psychology and the Teacher, Reading and Reading Development, Rural Science and Education, School and Classroom-based Curriculum Development, School Management and Education, Science and Education, Studies in Affective Education, Personal and Social Development, Studies in Craft Education, Studies in Numeracy, Studies in Student Welfare in Schools and Colleges, Studies in the Teaching of Religion, Testing and Assessment in the Classroom, and Topics in Science. An Education Project is also offered to provide for research requirements.

3. Senior Staff Development Program

Critical Skills in Educational Administration, Curriculum Management and Delivery, Curriculum Workshop, Evaluation and the Teacher, and an Education Project